

OBSERVATIONS  
ON DR. DUGENAN

—  
PATRICK LATTIN

LONDON 1800



IRISH 1798 COLLECTION



OBSERVATIONS  
ON  
DR. DUGENAN'S  
FAIR REPRESENTATION  
Of the present Political State  
OF  
IRELAND;  
Particularly, with respect to his  
STRICTURES  
On a Pamphlet, entitled the  
CASE OF IRELAND RECONSIDERED,

---

BY PATRICK LATTIN, Esq.

---

O NAVIS! REFERENT IN MARE TE NOVI  
FLUCTUS? O QUID AGIS! FORTITER OCCUPA  
PORTUM.—

MOR.

*If we were one people with the British nation, it would not be necessary, for the safety of the empire at large, to curb Romanists, by any exclusive law whatever.*

Dr. Duigenan's Answer to Mr. Grattan.

---

LONDON:

SOLD BY J. DEBRETT, PICCADILLY.

1800.

DA 950  
.2  
.138  
1800X

---

## P R E F A C E.

IN the following pages I have endeavoured to fulfill a duty which I considered incumbent on me; and to refute the imputations which "*The Case of Ireland Reconsidered*" has drawn on the Roman Catholics, not only of Ireland, but of the whole world, from Dr. Duigenan. Professing to write for the instruction of the English nation, he appears totally ignorant of their distinctive character. On his own authority, he passes at once upon all Roman Catholics such a sentence, as an English Jury, after the most minute investigation of facts, guided by the ablest and most impartial opinion, would

hesitate to pronounce upon a single individual.

The charge, brought by the Doctor, against the body of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, is certainly most serious; it accuses them, both generally and individually, of the highest crime known to the laws of civil society—of treason and rebellion, which he affirms are engrafted in their minds, by the tenets of their religion.

I am certain, however, that the impartiality of the British public, will not condemn so large a portion of their fellow-subjects, merely because they are accused, and that they will be anxious to investigate the grounds on which it has been attempted to establish and to repel the accusation.

---

## OBSERVATIONS, &c.

---

FINDING that a book, which has lately been published by Wright, in London, and Millikin, in Dublin, with the name of Patrick Duigenan, L. L. D. contains many unwarranted inferences, from different passages of a pamphlet, intitled, “*The Case of Ireland reconsidered, in Answer to Arguments for and against an Union,*” and that many sentiments are imputed to its Author, which, not only upon minute examination, are not there to be found either expressed or implied, but are in absolute contradiction to what is there advanced; it is hoped the public will not dis-

countenance an attempt to set them right, with respect to these, and some other mis-statements, and some quotations so glaringly false, that it is not easy to conceive how they escaped the attention of the Author of this *fair Representation of the present State of Ireland*. Nor can these unlucky mistakes, which might be construed by some into want of candour, be imputed either to hurry, or to sudden ebullition of temper, the author having allowed himself abundant time to reflect, and to sooth any degree of irritation proceeding from unusual contradiction in a favourite opinion.

Whosoever takes upon himself to address the public, upon any subject in which he supposes their interest is concerned, endeavours either to convince them of the truth which he supports, if it be of a nature to admit of demonstration, or to persuade them to a belief of it upon the authority whence it proceeds, if it be such, as must apply rather to the feelings than to the understanding. Yet such is the prevailing indolence of our nature, when we ourselves are not the immediate object, that most important facts, which admit of positive proof, are too often taken upon the mere assertion of whoever first or last advances them. There is even a sort of reputation of wisdom and knowledge which may be established on such grounds, and

and may exist as long as no indiscreet use of it provokes inquiry. He who has an interest in establishing false opinions, never fails to profit of this disposition. But before he obtains this species of implicit belief, it is reasonable that his candour, his temper, the purity of his motives, should be the proofs of his mission, and the grounds of passive acquiescence. If he is found deficient in any of these qualities, he must have recourse to some other mode of conversion ; for, even in the most obdurate breasts, are feelings which sympathise with truth, and lead our judgement almost as instinctively as pity does our most unguarded passions, or an innate sense of justice, our dealings with mankind ; it has a character, *which, without passing through the judgement, gains the heart.*

To such then as are willing to take the trouble of it, I submit the investigation of facts and of proof. To those whose occupations or turn of mind will not allow them to do it, (for in so critical a moment, when the political existence of millions, and the tranquillity of a nation, are at stake, none will say that the subject is not deserving of it); to those I appeal whether anger, violence, personal abuse, and misrepresentation, are among the tokens of that authority to which honest and

sensible men willingly resign their judgement? Whether the avowed attempt to convey mandates or instructions, to the presiding wisdom of a great nation in such terms, be consistent with the decorum and respect to which such arduous and elevated situations are entitled, or a proof of that education and knowledge of the better part of mankind, which gives to bare assertions a right, by courtesy, to some degree of deference. If the disqualifications under which the Roman Catholics of Ireland labour, and the many evils which proceed more from their being thus made a separate class in the nation, than from those disqualifications themselves, affected them alone, to speak either on one side or the other, might have an appearance of party; but as the inconvenience is manifestly not less for those who exclude, than for those who are excluded, and has been for more than two centuries severely felt by the empire at large, any attempt to obviate so much mischief will at least be acquitted of a partial motive. Much has been done in the generosity of the legislature for the Roman Catholics; may what remains be done in its wisdom for both Catholic and Protestant!

It is a great satisfaction to the mind, not of one particular class only, (for that would be a narrow consideration,) but of every friend of mankind, to compare

compare the arguments used twenty or thirty years ago, in support of the penal code, with those which are now advanced, to prolong the exclusion of Roman Catholics from their full share in that free state of which they are members. The tales of the nursery are now confined to it, the fabrications which those who spread them would have blushed to be supposed to believe, are now repeated only by men, whose circumstances shut them out from enlarged society, who, if their travels ever extend to the summit of the neighbouring mountain, are astonished to find that the world is so large. The periods of history, which unfortunately, even without exaggeration, might awaken painful and antisocial sensations in the breast of both parties, have been passed over by the greatest statesmen and orators in the British senate, with a magnanimity, or touched upon, when argument required it, with a delicacy, not the least affecting, nor least noble part of eloquence. To use the expressive language of a great political character upon that occasion, men are now no more surprised that, after raising our fellow-subject from his grovelling situation, and placing him upon his feet, he should presume to look us in the face.

If almost every year of the last thirty, has produced some amelioration of the laws and spirit of  
the

the empire, in regard to religious differences, if the mitigations and repeals of those penal laws, as well as the liberal opinions which preceded them, have uniformly come from the more improved country, is there not a moral certainty for the Roman Catholic, that as improvement is more diffused, and intercourse becomes more frequent, every political distinction, on account of religious opinion, must disappear? To him it is a proud reflection, that his cause is committed to the progress of the human mind; to us all a consoling one, that as we become wiser, we become better; that ignorance is often in the way of general happiness than malignity.

Doctor Duigenan's book, I think, has a good chance of being the last, written in the English language, in the spirit of the sixteenth century.

Page 16. The boldest experiment which, perhaps, was ever yet attempted upon the indolent acquiescence of mankind, at the very door of conviction, is that which he ventures, in his quotation, of the oath of the Roman Catholic titular bishops. He attacks it with great invective, as inconsistent with the allegiance of a subject to his sovereign. It is the foundation of almost all his reasoning against the admission of those who bear equal burdens to equal advantages. He has recourse to the mechanical

nical aids of eloquence, the type is changed to rivet your attention to the main jet and bearing of his argument, least, through any inadvertence, the words which he has inserted into it, to answer his purpose, should escape your attention.

But Dr. Troy's publication which, upon that <sup>Pastoral</sup> and many other occasions he quotes largely, and <sup>Instruc-</sup> as often as it serves his purpose, correctly, con- <sup>Dublin,</sup> tains 17 pages, from p. 42 to 59, of a letter from <sup>1793.</sup> the late unfortunate Pope, Pius VI. of the house of Braschi, in Latin, and in English, explaining all these passages objected to, disclaiming all these obnoxious doctrines, and all interference with the power of princes, which might malignantly or ignorantly be inferred from them. But above all, enjoining to all the titular archbishops and bishops of Ireland, to substitute, in the place of the ancient form of oath, that oath which was publicly repeated by the bishop of Mohilow, to the great satisfaction of the court of Petersburgh, retrenching the words at which the Doctor takes so much offence: *Heretics, schismatics, and rebels, to our holy Father, and his successors, I shall resist and persecute\* to my power;* and

\* Whoever understands Latin, and has, read the oath in that language, will perceive, that this is not a true translation.

and concluding with these remarkable words: *I will observe all and every one of these things the more inviolably, as I am firmly convinced, that there is nothing contained in them which can be contrary to the fidelity I owe to the most serene King of Great Britain, and to his successors, and to the throne, so help me, God, and these holy gospels of God.* Thus I promise and engage: and all this, that no shadow of pretext might be left for ill-will, calumny, or misrepresentation. Yet the Author of this *Fair Representation of the present State of Ireland*, with Dr. Troy's book in his hand, asserts, that these words are actually contained in the oath of Roman Catholic titular bishops, and that it is such as he gives it, grounding upon it his arguments to the people of England, whom he professes to undeceive, for their consent to the exclusion of two millions of their fellow-subjects from the same rights they themselves enjoy, under the same government, and for which they pay in Ireland the same price, without even the equivalent allowed to other Dissenters. Nor has the Doctor chosen to take this oath from the work, published, in 1793, by

lation, the word *prosequor* never meant persecute. The third and fourth questions in the consecration of Bishops of the Church of England, come nearer the sense.

that gentleman, deservedly respected by all parties, nor from the letter of the Pope, in 1791, of neither of which he could be ignorant, but from Bishop Burnet's History of the Reformation, written a hundred years ago. Thus inserting clauses which are not in it, to an- <sup>Page 16,</sup>swer his end, leaving out others which he knew to <sup>17.</sup> be in it, because they would defeat his end.

What credit now can any reasonable man be required to give to all his other charges, and the articles of treason which he exhibits so repeatedly against two millions, by his own computation, of his Majesty's loyal and faithful subjects.

How distant in his progress, and at his conclusions may we expect to find him, from that only true line, which is the guide of fair and solid reasoning, when at his first step he deviates from it so widely. What sort of information can <sup>Page 2.</sup> British statesmen, for whose instruction he modestly professes to write, expect from such a tutor? Does he hold out his book as a proof of his boasted charity, forbearing temper, and good faith, in the Protestants of Ireland? Thank God it is well known, that very few of them speak such language, or entertain such sentiments.

Page 138. The pamphlet upon which he says, with great appearance of truth, he has wasted too much paper and ink, and which indeed does not seem to contain matter to take up so much of any man's time as he has been pleased to bestow upon it, was published in London, probably because the Author of it usually resided there ; not as Dr. Duigenan would insinuate, with any weak design of imposing upon ignorant people, much less with an idea so absurd and so derogatory to the understanding of the leading men of the English nation, that they would found the preliminaries of the Union upon any such information, and conclude it, as he supposes they might, but for his warning voice, before they had allowed themselves time to be undeceived. His own work, and many others upon Irish affairs, first appeared in London. His very serious personal charges, against thereputed author of the pamphlet in question, will probably be answered in a proper place ; nor shall any notice be taken of his abusive language.

“ Contemptible sophistry and assurance,” “ absurd petulance,” “ base,” “ insidious,” “ lying,” “ malignant,” “ malicious,” “ virulent,” “ dogmatical,” “ impudent,” “ insolent,” “ republican,” “ jacobin,” “ slanderer,” “ atheist,” “ deist,” and

“ philosopher.”\* In general, this sort of phraseology conveys no idea to the mind beyond that of the education, manners, and temper of the

of

\* Such expressions must shock the ears of those who are unaccustomed to controversy, a subject which a few authors have lately endeavoured, but I trust unsuccessfully, to revive among us. They were the common language of the schools in the 16th century; I mean the schools of polemic divinity; for polite literature softens the manners and improves the heart.

*Mentiris impudentissime*, you are a most impudent liar, was not an uncommon figure of rhetoric in those times. This style does not always exclude wit. *Taceas rufe Juda*, exclaimed a jesuit, to a red bearded capucin, whom he could not answer, (on such occasion abuse is successfully applied). *Quod Judas refus erat*, replied the friar, *est conjectura, quod fuit e societate Jesu est scriptura*. *Fiat lux*, says another, who could not understand his oponent’s argument, *lux lucet, sed tenebræ eam non comprehenderunt*. I make this digression, to shew of what enjoyments the refinement of our days deprives us, and what obligation we ought to have to those who labour to bring us back to the good old taste.

*Snarling cur, insects on a dunghill, explosions on the Protestants* Page 152.  
*of bombs, carcases, and stink pots*, which, with the *posterior trumpet of fame*, we also find in the mouth of Dr. Duigenan, *os magna sonitum*, p. 152, are still in a higher strain of classical scurrility.

Ma prima avea ciascun la lingua stretta  
 Co’denti verso lor duca per cenno;  
 Ed egli avea; del cul fatto trombetta.

INFERN, Cant. 21.

person who allows himself to use it. If that pamphlet has had any effect upon the public mind,

But the authority for this species of eloquence is much older than Dante. The Doctor, whose style is enriched with the sweets of every flower of ancient and modern literature, knows that Achilles does not hesitate to call even the king of men, Οἰνοφαρεῖς, χρήστος ὅμηρος ἔχειν καρδίην δίκαιον.

Thou monster mix'd of insolence and fear,  
Thou dog in forehead, but in heart a deer.

POPE.

The inscription under a bust of King William, in Nassau-street, opposite the College-garden, Dublin, is also in this chaste style of remote antiquity :

May we never want a Williamite  
To kick the breech of a jacobite !

That, said to have been over the gates of Bandon, will also merit a conspicuous place in our memoirs, and bear ample testimony of our polished state of society, whenever we establish in our capital an academy of inscriptions.

A Jew, a Turk, an Athiest,  
May enter here, but not a Papist !

The Bishop of Derry asked an Irish friar at Rome, his opinion of this inscription. My Lord, says he, it is most certainly copied from one over the gates of hell.

After differing so essentially from Dr. Duigenan in argument, where he is supported neither by reason nor precedent, a sense of justice obliges me to offer him this defence of his style, and pay that tribute to his taste, which no man of my *kidney* (to borrow one of his own elegant expressions, I assure him without any intention of keeping it, p. 130,) can pay to his judgement.

(and

(and by the extraordinary vehemence with which he runs it down, one would be tempted to think it had,) appealing from passion to cool sense, which does the Doctor really think? That contradiction, conveyed in such terms, will lessen or confirm that effect? Which cause does he sincerely think he will hurt, by such unfair and disingenuous constructions as the following pages will shew, he has not been above calling to his aid? It is but a wretched reprieve for a condemned cause, that which can extend but from false testimony to conviction.

The terms Romish, Romanist, Paynite, Burkite, Burkism, do not appear to bear any of those marks upon which new words may be admitted into a civilized language.

—Dabitur que licentia sumta pudenter,  
Et nova, fictaque nuper habebunt verba fidem, si  
Græco fonte carent parce detorta.

HOR.

I must therefore decline using them, until they procure a passport from higher authority. If Dr. Duigenan thinks the word Romanist or Romish, with which he would enrich our language, and which, in the dialect he adopts, must be synonymous with Roman Catholic, or have no meaning,

ing, conveys any thing of contempt or of reproach, he is quite mistaken. As long as the first princes, the greatest generals, the ablest statesmen of Europe, glory in that appellation, and the proudest races of England, and every Protestant country, will blush not to trace their pedigrees through many a generation of that description, in spite of the Doctor's efforts, no man will be ashamed of it. Nor will he gain much more credit, by marshalling the Roman Catholic Church, on the side of atheism and jacobinism, while its princes, its clergy, its nobles, and its people, are under the eyes of the whole world, and in every corner of it, making such immense sacrifices in opposition to them. Let me also remind him, that some of the most venerable law authorities in our courts, and the brightest ornaments of our literature, were, what he calls, Romish authors.

Case of  
Ireland,  
&c.

Every statement in the *Case of Ireland reconsidered*, of the population of that country, and of the comparative wealth and numbers of the two religions which so unhappily divide it, were taken from the pamphlet it attempted to answer, the author of which was possessed of the most ample means of information, and of talents to make a judicious use of them. It was premised (p. 1 & 2), that no one step would be risked beyond what his authority would support, that his very words would

be

be used, and in the exact meaning the context attached to them. All the polite contradictions therefore, the direct charges of base falsehood, and malignant misrepresentation which they have drawn upon him, cannot fairly be placed to his own account, by the author of the *Case of Ireland reconsidered*. Nor does that pamphlet seem to have been written, as Dr. Duigenan advances, Page 6. with any pretension of arguing against the Union. Some arguments, indeed, are advanced against it, and some in favour of it, but any decided opinion upon the subject was expressly reserved until the general terms of it were known.

The only intention of its author appears to have been, to prove to others, if he could, as forcibly as he felt it himself, that the Union would be a measure ineffectual for the security, interior tranquillity, and civilization of Ireland, with whatever other circumstances it might be attended, if it did not extend to the Roman Catholics, who form the large mass of population, not only legally but *virtually*,\* the whole benefit of the constitution which they

\* That is, by really extending to the Roman Catholics the benefits of the repeal of the laws, which shut them out from all places of honour and profit. It will answer no purpose that the law shall allow them to be in certain situations, if the great men of the country set their faces against their admission; the

they are to live under, and to maintain at the risk of their lives and properties. That to leave any political inequality, on account of religious opinion; was to leave the root of mutual hatred and distrust; which, however deeply it might be covered or cut down, would not fail to shoot up again, as it had done so often before, to the ruin of the country: That no increase of strength, in wealth or population, could be safe, until its most disguised and latent fibre was eradicated; that before power and riches were conferred, as they are to be by an Union, content and attachment should be secured. That, otherwise, we must again behold the inestimable resources which Ireland offers to the British empire, either restrained in their growth, by unnatural laws, or wasted in civil contention, to the subversion, perhaps, of the empire, which they might have raised to the highest pitch of human greatness. He wished also to convince others, as it appears he was sincerely convinced himself, that this may be done without endangering the constitution of this Protestant state, or the establishment of the

the bad effects of partiality will be the same, whether it exist in law, or in practice; a few of the inferior places in the different departments of government, distributed among the sons of substantial farmers and tradesmen throughout the country; would have an excellent effect in attaching the lower orders to the government and laws. The red book is a proof that such has not been the practice.

Protestant

Protestant church. That, its present security, founded on the exclusion of two-thirds of the people, and the consequently partial and contracted distribution of the honours and emoluments of the state, had many inconveniencies in its direct and indirect effects, while another was offered, as flattering to national pride, though not to private interests, which had none of these inconveniencies, and was as strong and as safe. That, danger from the encroachments of Papal dominion no longer existed, they had been rejected and resisted by all Catholic countries, and by England herself, long before the reformation. The spirit which guided them was a stranger to the religion whose mask it wore ; it was for ever extinct ; that, it would be impolitic to sacrifice the welfare, perhaps the safety, of the empire to the prejudices, the pride, or the exclusive views of any party.

That, if the Union proposed was attended with this only advantage, of making one people of the inhabitants of Ireland, it must be a beneficial measure, if it was not attended with that advantage, it must be an inadequate one, and the empire would have to meet the same difficulties, perhaps, in a more formidable shape.

No better epitome of the sense and tendency of this pamphlet can be made, than in the words of

Answer  
to Mr.  
Grattan.

Dr. Duigenan himself, in the title page of these sheets. Its whole aim and end, setting aside every other view of the Union, was to establish the position the Doctor himself so unequivocally advances: "That it would not, in the event of an Union, be necessary, for the safety of the empire at large, to curb the Romanists, by any exclusive laws whatever." Doctor Duigenan is the oracle of his party, and the language of oracles has generally been doubtful and obscure, but seldom so inconsistent, and flatly contradictory.

I know not what motives he has since had, in the course of a few months, for abandoning this sentiment into which he has led so distinguished a member of the British senate. The virulence and passion, with which he now repels what he so lately advanced, are the natural consequences of sudden recantation.

If the time, of such as may choose to peruse these few pages, is now to be taken up by a statement of some of Dr. Duigenan's misrepresentations, it is not for the satisfaction of any private feeling, but to expose the spirit in which he has written, and the advantages he condescends to take, with a mistaken idea of supporting his cause,

He

He ought not to have mutilated the phrase, (page 6), in order to make\* for himself an opportunity of accusing the author of arrogance for saying. *I should be no enemy to the Union on such terms.* Case of Ireland. Page 45. There would have been no room for his ironical taunt, if he had quoted with it, that common place salvo of modesty, which is a member of the same phrase, *of what little consequence so ever my opinion may be.*

When he accuses an author of plagiarism, as in page 12, and many other places, his bare word is not sufficient authority.

This is of little import, it only serves to shew how awkwardly he endeavours to hurt, even by personalities, a general cause. Such arguments resemble the clumsy props we see heaped round a moldering tenement, when it has been abandoned by every reputable tenant.

I appeal to the public—Is his interpretation of Page 76. a note, (page 6, Case of Ireland), an honest one? Perhaps it may be puerile, and might better have been excluded from the margin as it was from the text. But when the gallantry of the British militia with the fair, as well as in the field, (those

• Slander, like jealousy, is—a green eyed monster, which makes the meat it feeds on. *Shakespear.*

are the words) is mentioned, could any one think it was meant as an insinuation of want of discipline, in those troops, whose conduct has been so exemplary, and whom the people of Ireland never mention but with tears of gratitude.

Page 76. His next false quotation is a very curious one : *After styling the Protestant religion a Medusa's head, which paralyses a large portion of our people, or turns their arms against each other, and thereby admitting what he in other places denies, that the last rebellion, as well as the preceding ones, was a Romish rebellion.* The word Protestant religion is not mentioned, nor the idea in any manner implied through the five preceding pages. The word Medusa's head, referred, in a way which no child that can read could mistake, to the Pope with his treble crown upon his head, mentioned immediately before ; how could Dr. Duigenan mistake that, and twice mistake it, for he has repeated it (page 97.) for the Protestant religion. Here is the phrase, (page 15, Case of Ireland reconsidered :) " France will sooner drag the Pope from " his cloister, at Sienna, and set him up again " with his treble crown upon his head, to scare " us from our own interest, than suffer us to re- " cover our senses, and come forward in the ple- " nitude of our power. What is our power to " her, when that Medusa's head can paralyse so " large

“ large a portion of our people, or turn their arms  
 “ against each other ?” Where is the Protestant  
 religion there ? Where the avowal, that the late  
 rebellion was a Romish one, as he calls it ? Is it  
 not evidently meant, that France, and every other  
 inveterate selfish enemy of British greatness, will  
 foment to their last breath the religious dissensions  
 which divide and paralyse our strength, and for  
 that purpose paint the Pope and his power in the  
 most terrible colours, and cherish the serpents of  
 discord, to fright us from our own interest, which  
 is in the hearty union of all our people ?

And again, he accuses the Author of the *Case* Page 76.  
*of Ireland reconsidered*, of saying, *England is now a bankrupt*, with which it would be highly imprudent  
*for Ireland to have any connection*; I have sought  
 in vain for any thing that could be tortured into  
 this meaning, in the pamphlet. I find the directly  
 contrary sentiment strongly impressed, (page 20,) —  
*Here, perhaps, may be the place to observe, that, though Ireland is not specially pledged for the debt of England, yet if it were possible a bankruptcy could take place in England both individually and nationally, Ireland, through every class of her inhabitants would feel in a great degree the effects of it.* Is this calling England a bankrupt, and advising Ireland to have no connection with her ?  
*Fair Representation.*

And then, after observing on the success of the Netherlands, in throwing off the Spanish yoke, and their right to do so, he insinuates, that in Ireland, separation from Great Britain, and independency, should be maintained at all hazards; and concludes with the maxim of one of the French demagogues, that, insurrection is the most sacred of our duties, pretending to deduce the justice of those treasonable aphorisms from a passage in the pamphlet of his antagonist. *Fair Representation*, p. 75.

The first argument there laid down (*in Arguments for and against an Union*) is, that every independent society or state has a right to propose the means which appear most probable for the attainment of the happiness of its people, consistent with its duties and obligations, in answer to which the *Case of Ireland reconsidered* has. But what duties and obligations can be in opposition to the happiness of the people? This is a large concession, and might lead speculative men to advance, if they thought it would contribute to the happiness of the people, that separation and independency ought to be maintained at all hazards. (See *Arguments for and against an Union*, for these last words). When this is supported by quoting, (See *Arguments for and against an Union*), the right which the author of that pamphlet says the Spanish Netherlands had to separate from the Spanish government, because they were oppressed (See *Arguments for and against an Union*), we fall insensibly into the maxim, we certainly have often enough heard reprobated—that max-

im which brought its author to the dungeons of Olmutz. *L'insurrection est le plus saint des devoirs.* *Case of Ireland reconsidered*, p. 7 and 8.

I own I am not so deeply read as the learned Doctor ought to be, in the councils of the 13th century; yet I will venture to assure him, that no Roman Catholic in the world believes, that no Roman Catholic state admits, the decrees of the council of Lateran, with the interpretation he endeavours to put upon them. I will only observe upon that subject, that the decrees of a council, ordering, at the request of temporal princes, (ambassadors from all of them were present) the faithful to act in conjunction with their princes against a particular heresy, then making very great progress against the church, and very formidable ravages in society, cannot, by any means, be construed into an immutable article of faith, regulating the conduct of Roman Catholics against the consent of temporal princes, in very dissimilar circumstances, upwards of five hundred years after. The principles against which its decrees were levelled, threatened devastation to the world at that time, and have since put their threats in execution. The learned Abbé Barruel, whose *History of Jacobinism*,\*

• See Barruel's Antimonarchical Conspiracy, note to page 405, vol. ii. Memoirs of Jacobinism, translated by the Hon. Robert Clifford.

has met with such universal approbation, has proved that the Manicheans or Albigeois were, in civil and religious doctrine, the forerunners of the Jacobins. The test, by which they were subjected to the penalties of the law, was their denial of all temporal power, and right in civil magistrates to inforce obedience. May not the interference of Dr. Troy, in politics, by excommunicating the adherents to the late rebellion, in which, perhaps, a very commendable zeal, made him overlook the precise bounds of spiritual authority, be brought forward in some years hence, as another proof of usurpation and interference in temporals in the Catholic Church.?

It is now more than a century since we have heard of troubles occasioned in any country by the pretensions of Popes, and we may rest in very reasonable security, that many centuries will pass, before such pretensions are again heard of. Unless such authors as Dr. Duigenan are very successful indeed, in alarming us with the shadow long after the substance has disappeared.

In this manner, from the decrees of a council in the 13th century, supported by all the temporal powers of Europe, against the Manicheans, does he attempt to prove the danger of the interference of the church of Rome in our days, with the temporal power of princes.

His first step to get at the conclusion, that Roman Catholics ought not to be admitted, &c. is a false quotation of the oath of their bishops, which we have already seen.

His second step is the Council of Lateran. As in this last instance it is evident, that not only these decrees had the consent of all the temporal princes of Europe, but that their power was as much endangered by the errors which this council condemned, as the faith of the church itself; his third step is to prove, or rather to assert, that, *in a Romish State the sovereign power, whether it be a monarchy or a republic, being vested in Romanists, its consent to the decrees of its own church, of which they admit the Pope to be the supreme head, is certain.* Page 21.

Certain; when properly manifested, as to all spiritual matters having nothing to do with any thing temporal; but history is full of the contentions of Catholic Princes and Popes, when they have attempted to proceed one step farther: their pretensions, beyond this mere spiritual authority, respected by all Roman Catholics, have ever been admitted, or repelled, in Catholic States, especially in England before the reformation, in proportion to the sense or weakness of the Prince

who reigned, or to the nature of his title to the crown, but never had any thing to do with the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith. The sovereigns of Europe themselves, whose views of ambition it happened to serve for the time, were the most strenuous supporters of this usurpation of temporal power in the Popes. As the court of Rome was, in those days, the most enlightened in Europe, and a sort of common centre, it was made the umpire in disputes between crowned heads. If the father, who was an ambitious man, did not disdain to accept from the Pope the kingdom of Ireland, which he had no right to give, is it surprising that a Pope should accept from the son, who was a weak man, the kingdom of England, which he had no right to offer? For the doctrine, that the Pope cannot err, nor do wrong, never was an article of faith in the Roman Catholic church. These, and many similar transactions were acts of feudal suzerainty, not of religion. Philip of Valois, whose piety procured him the surname of Catholic, supported by the opinion of his clergy, wrote to Pope John XXII. that he would have him burned, if he persisted in his erroneous doctrines—*Et manda qu'il se revoquaist ou qu'il le ferait ardre.*\*

\* Nat. Alexandri, Hist. Eccles. vol. vii. p. 552.

Philip II. accused of being a bigotted Catholic, refused to admit in his States the bull in *cæna domini*. Many other Roman Catholic states absolutely refused to admit the tribunal of the inquisition.\*

I will add to these proofs two or three passages from the history of those times, as they appear to be not quite so uninteresting as those kind of documents generally are ; and I will take them from a Roman Catholic professor of divinity, a doctor of Sorbonne, a church historian of great weight, who supports the same doctrine, that it may not be suspected of not being conformable to the belief of the church.

Boniface VIII. took upon him to interfere with Edward I. about the crown of Scotland ; but the nobles of England wrote back to his holiness, that “ it was not proper the kings of England should

\* The Marquis de Pombal, the well-known Minister of a very Catholic state, used to receive the Pope's bulls with the greatest reverence, kiss them, and throw them aside as often as he thought the admission of them inexpedient. The great statesmen of other countries cannot hear, without a smile, the idea we have of the interference of the Pope with their power, how well it agrees with such characters as Cardinal Richelieu, or the late Duke de Choiseul ?

answer to any ecclesiastical or secular judge, with respect to their royal or temporal rights, nor submit themselves to the jurisdiction even of the apostolic see, for in no time did any temporal power ever belong, nor does there now belong any, to the aforesaid church: nor did the kings of England, in their rights over that kingdom, nor in any other of their temporal rights, render any account, nor ought they to render any, to any whatsoever secular or ecclesiastical judge, from the pre-eminence of their slate, and of their royal dignity, and from customs strictly observed through all times: wherefore, having considered the contents of your letter, the common, concordant, and unanimous opinion of us all, and of each of us, was, and, with God's help, will unalterably ever be, that our aforesaid Lord King, with respect to the rights of the kingdom of Scotland, or any other temporal right, shall by no means answer juridically before you, nor submit to your decisions in any manner, nor suffer any doubt to be entertained about his aforesaid rights, nor send to your presence agents or ambassadors to that purpose; and this the more, as such conduct would be derogatory to the rights of the crown of England, and the royal dignity; and a subversion of the well-known state of that kingdom, to the prejudice of the liberties, customs, and laws of our forefathers; to the maintenance and defence of which,

which, we are bound by the obligation of the oath we have taken, and which, by the help of God, we will, with our whole power and strength, defend. Nor do we permit, nor should we ever permit, nor can we, nor ought we, permit our aforesaid Lord King to do any such act, even if he were willing so to do; or in any way to attempt things so unusual, so contrary to right, so prejudicial, so every way unheard of. Wherefore with great reverence and humility we supplicate your holiness, that as far as relates to our said Lord the King, who, like the other Princes of the earth, professes himself a Catholic, and devoutly attached to the Roman church, that you will, out of your goodness, permit him to possess, in peace, and without disturbance or diminution, and to continue, without any alteration, in the enjoyment of the aforesaid rights, liberties, customs, and laws.”

The letters of King Edward and the Barons to Boniface VIII. are in Walsingham’s English History for the year 1302.\*

The act of deposition of Richard II. and the articles exhibited against him, may be seen in the second volume of Old English History, from the chronicles of Henry Knighton, page 2743, and in

\* Natalis Alexandri, Hist. Eccl. tom. vii. p. 319. Edit. Par. 1699. See also Rapin Thoyras, Edit. 1st.

Rapin. The tenth of those articles objects to that monarch, that he had had recourse to the authority of the Popes, to confirm the temporal acts of his Parliaments, contrary to the royal dignity, and the liberties of the State. Here is the article: "Although the crown of England, and the rights of the said crown, and the kingdom itself, have been from all times so free, that our Lord the Pope, nor any other person out of the kingdom, ought not to interfere with them, yet our aforesaid King had recourse to the said Lord the Pope to confirm acts of his last Parliament."\*

Page 99. If then King James II. was *driven out*,† and lost his crown, for his partiality to papal jurisdiction, in a Protestant State, as is remarked, page 31, *Fair Representation*, King Richard II. lost his, for the same fault, in a Roman Catholic one. The Concordat established by Francis I. in France, the statutes of *Præmunire* in England, (though, in p. 65, he says, they only went to restrain the introduction, into the kingdom, of Popes bulls, which touched the King's crown and regality,

\* Rapin Thoyras, Rich. II. Ib. p. 322, vol. vii.

† In general, the word *abdication* among loyal subjects has been used to express this transaction. The republican faction, all over the world, will not fail to quote so respectable an authority as Dr. Duigenan, *for a king driven from his throne by his subjects*.

or his realm, and the execution of such bulls; and that, till Henry VIII. appeals to Rome, though *illegal* were connived at:) are proofs in point, as are also the constitutions of Clarendon, which, so early as the reign of Henry II. forbid the exercise, of papal jurisdiction in England; yet they were enacted by the Parliament of England, then all Catholics.—This last proof is expressed, in the very words which are published as the Doctor's own words, in a pamphlet said to contain the substance of a debate, upon this same subject, in the Irish House of Commons, on the 4th of May, 1795. *Dublin Chambers, No. 5, Abbey-Street, 1795.*—“It is true, he adds, the Irish Roman Catholics are more attached to this foreign jurisdiction than the English;” it must then be only a matter of opinion, not an article of faith, which the Doctor well knows is every where the same. But just now he assured us, that the contrary of his position could not be maintained, without ceasing to be a Catholic.

I have taken these among the many proofs, which history furnishes, of the jealousy and independent spirit of Roman Catholic countries, in ecclesiastical concerns, to destroy that assumed certainty of acquiescence with which, joined to a false quotation of the Oath of Roman Catholic

Titular

Titular Bishops, and his own interpretation of a council in the thirteenth century, he attempts to  
 Page 20. combat the position, *That men sincerely attached to the whole Roman Catholic Creed may be as good and faithful subjects of the British empire as Protestants*; and consequently as safely admissible to the share which their property, or their services may entitle them to in the supreme legislative and superior executive capacities, under their Protestant Sovereign. He endeavours then to argue from the spiritual power of the Pope, and its necessary connection with temporals.—*That Roman Catholic Monarchs, and governing members of Roman Catholic Republics, are, by the tenets of their religion, bound not only to consent to the execution but to execute the decrees of their Church, as well on the person as on the properties of their subjects.*

This is fully answered above, being only a part of his first proposition, standing or falling with it; but he has caused some confusion, and loss of time, by introducing, as from *The Case of Ireland reconsidered*, a proposition which neither is, nor could be, expressed or implied in it: (page 21), he says, the major proposition, to wit, *the spiritual authority of the Pope not being an inherent part of the Roman Catholic religion*; —the spiritual authority of the Pope is, and nothing can be produced from the pamphlet that denies or weakens it, an inherent part of the  
 Page 21. Roman

Roman Catholic religion ; but has no sanction of temporal law, no coercive power, in this life ; its object does not come under the senses, is not in this world, and can no way come in contact with civil existence ; it is as distinct from temporal power as spirit is from matter.

The council of Lateran, and Dr. Troy, whose authority the Doctor quotes, are both very right in saying, that, the other proposition, as he states it, is false ; but he was very wrong in saying, it was contained, or could be inferred, where he says he found it. With great fear and reverence be it spoken, the learned Doctor does not seem to distinguish properly, three very distinct ideas, spiritual, ecclesiastical, and temporal.

The Church, without any interference of the State, possesses spiritual power, but its only tribunal is in *foro conscientiae*. It may, in its interpretations of the divine laws, condemn those who adhere to its doctrines, to very great pains and penalties in the next world, but it must grant them a reprieve of execution until they are there ; for, in this world, it cannot touch a hair of the head of the most refractory sinner. If the word jurisdiction had not been employed to express two very different ideas, much confusion would have been avoided. The Church, with the consent of the state, may possess ecclesiastical

power, and as much of temporal power to sanction it as the state thinks proper to allow, and no more. The state is not obliged to allow it any; nor is its existence less certain, less extensive; perhaps it is even more pure, and more venerable without it. At Pekin or at Rome, under Dioclesian or under Constantine, in the palace of the monarch or in the cottage of the peasant, it is still the same, sublime, abstracted, spiritual relation, of the creature to his Creator: its object above, glory to God; its sole concern on earth, peace and good will to man.

Such it was, in the first ages of Christianity, before those fatal divisions which have stained the Christian world with Christian blood, were fomented to advance the selfish ends of individuals, at the expence of all that is dear to humanity.

This abstruse point of theology being not unintentionally entangled with politics, I have reluctantly ventured thus far into a tedious discussion with so learned a man upon his own ground. And I must still farther take upon myself to assure him, that the idea which he gives in this publication of the power of the Pope, or of the Church in Catholic States, and their willingness to admit it, is totally erroneous.

It is not the question of theology which I pretend to treat, but a political one, whether the Roman

Roman Catholic faith be incompatible with the duty of a subject in a free state? Whether these tenets of that faith are sufficient cause to deprive two millions of people of their rights?

Never was there a position on a worse foundation, nor more replete with mischief than this, that *Roman Catholic Monarchs, and governing members of Roman Catholic Republics, are, by the tenets of their religion, bound not only to consent to the execution, but to execute the decrees of their Church, as well on the persons as on the properties of their subjects.* The first Roman Catholic lawyers and divines have constantly, in all ages, denied it; the whole evidence of history is against it; the constitution of every Roman Catholic state in the world contradicts it. It scarcely appears credible, that Dr. Duigenan, who is looked up to, by his party, as the fountain of all knowledge; should write upon subjects so entirely connected with church history, and yet mistake Fleury, the celebrated church historian, for Cardinal Fleury, the well-known prime minister. (p. 11,) No man is obliged to know any thing of church history, nor is Roman history among our moral obligations; but indeed, if we pretend to write upon it for the instruction of others, we should, at least, know Tacitus the historian, from Tacitus the emperor. If he think it worth while to acquire information, he may study the history of the Galli-

can church, since the reign of Francis I. or read in any modern magazine the life of the late Emperor Joseph II. and his transactions with the See of Rome ; does he think that Emperor or his successors were very willing to share their power with the Pope ?

We have many existing proofs, under our eyes, that it is neither impossible nor impracticable, as he asserts, to separate a vast portion of temporal power, or any portion of it whatsoever, from spiritual supremacy.

The spiritual supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church, of many religious sects, of Quakers, Moravians, Calvinists, does actually exist, in its fullest extent, among their followers, in England, in America, in Germany, without an atom of temporal power. When they have read the refractory sinner out of meeting, or excommunicated him, their power ceases ; and even this, probably they could not legally do, unless he chose to submit to it. For I doubt much if they could publicly pass any such censure as might hurt his reputation, upon any of their members who should previously withdraw himself from their community. To his question then, what degree of temporal power and influence does the supremacy in spirituals derive from the exclusive jurisdiction respecting Heresy ? I answer, None. And every Roman Catholic all over

over the world will answer, None. What degree of temporal power and influence does the exclusive matrimonial jurisdiction confer? None.

No matter how a marriage is contracted, whether by a Protestant, a Catholic, a Quaker, an Anabaptist, or a Moravian; or, whether it is held to be a sacrament, or a mere civil contract: If it be not according to the law of the land where it takes place, it is, to all legal intents and purposes, no marriage. If two persons publicly cohabit without a proper sanction for so doing, if such be the discipline of the place, let them be indicted, and answer for it. This once known, where is the inconvenience? After following him step by step through all his arguments, it now remains to see what use he makes of his position, when he assumes it as granted.

*All subjects of a State, who deny that the supreme power, by which that State is constitutionally governed, is exclusively intitled to enact and execute all laws for the good government of that State, and who maintain, as part of their religious creed, that a power exists extraneous and separate from the State, and not under its control and dominion, which can make laws, and enforce their execution among the subjects of that State, in many particulars, are enemies to its independence, and traitors: admitted; but hear the consequence he draws: Irish Romanists, (that is to say, Roman Catholics*

Catholics in general, for they have not two faiths) universally maintain, as an immutable tenet of their religion, the supremacy of the Pope, in all *spiritual matters within this kingdom* (which spirituality has nothing to do with this power), heresy is of spiritual cognizance, so is matrimony, and the Romanists hold it to be a sacrament; therefore all Roman Catholics are traitors; and I ask this Author, whether he can produce a single instance, in which a State, having sufficient power to exclude all traitors from its sovereignty, voluntarily called them to the exercise of supreme power. This would be the case, if Irish Romanists were admitted into the Houses of Lords and Commons. The rest of the phrase confirms the sense, and this is the reasoning he offers to Englishmen, supposed to excel all other nations in that particular faculty: and in a State, governed by laws, existing for the protection of its subjects, he asserts, and publishes in the capital of the British empire, that the Roman Catholic peers, the Roman Catholic gentry, the Roman Catholic officers entrusted with the command of his Majesty's troops; the Roman Catholic soldiers who spilt their blood for his Majesty and their country, that, all his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects are traitors. Is he to be allowed to shove the able and equitable judges of the land from their benches, substitute his caprice for law, and thus pronounce the sentence of his spleen upon so large a body of men, in contempt of the

repeated

repeated testimonies which they have received from his Majesty, and his Ministers, that they are good and loyal subjects.\* If he does not mean Roman Catholics, what has he been writing about? And does he again mean them, by *those who are taught by their religion, not only to renounce and disobey, but to villify and traduce the supremacy of the legislature, and who thus ally superstition to treason, and, as it were, sanctify rebellion?* Page 30.

Who but himself, and the shallowest reasoners against all religion, ever affected to suppose, that such a religion could exist, and that it was precisely that religion, which the greater part of the Sovereigns of Europe encouraged and maintained among their subjects? If he means the Roman Catholic religion, whose tenets are the same all over the universe, and most of them received by all Christian Churches, the garment thus stained, by unnatural brethren, will not be acknowledged by our common father.

What an acquisition, to the enemies of Christianity, are such accusations among Christians? What narrow mind does not comprehend how

\* See the preambles to the several Acts of Parliament, passed during the reign of his present Majesty, for the relief of his Roman Catholic subjects. If they be traitors, as Dr. Duigenan says they are, of what crime are his Majesty's Ministers, and the Members of the Legislature, (who passed these Acts) guilty?

nearly all its branches are allied? In what confined sphere of observation has his life been past, who has not sometimes smiled, to hear the partizans of different Christian sects accusing each other of superstition and religious tyranny, rending between them the veil of the temple, while the deist or the atheist was silently collecting his arguments, or sharpening his wit at the expence of both? Who has not pitied the ignorance of some foreigners, who, without understanding it, have laughed at the idea, that the head of the English church can do no wrong; or that the Roman church cannot err? yet there is nothing but what, properly explained, is perfectly reconcileable to good sense either in the impeccability of the one, or in the infallibility of the other.

I must here request the indulgence of my readers for making a very short digression, to take notice of another argument of Dr. Duigenan's, against Roman Catholics; I take what are said to have been his own words, in a debate in the Irish House of Commons, May 4th, 1795. Chambers 95.

On the bill for the *A second avowed principle of Roman Catholics, which fartherre-prevents a full communication of political power in lie of his Majestys Popish, or ncl cause of separation between them and Protestants, Roman Catholic, is that uncharitable tenet of exclusive salvation. This uncharitable opinion tends strongly to render Roman Catholics irreconcileable enemies to Protestants. How can*

can any real amity subsist between them, when the Roman Catholic believes his Protestant neighbour to be a living tabernacle for the devil, and that his spirit immediately on its separation from the body descends to hell, and is doomed to eternal misery? Now this tenet of the Roman Catholic faith, cannot be expressed in stronger terms in any part of its doctrine, than it is in the first, second, and last sentence of the Creed of St. Athanasius, appointed by the Liturgy of the Church of England, to be said, or sung, upon certain feasts, by the people standing, instead of the Apostle's Creed.\*

“ Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith.”

“ Which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastinglly.”

“ This is the Catholic faith which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved. The Doctor adds in this pamphlet, given as the substance of the debate, May 4th, 1795, by Chambers, Dublin.”

\* See Common Prayer Book.

“ This (the tenet of Roman Catholics) is a cruel and unchristian doctrine, and calculated for eternal discord and separation, and the Protestant church, as the truth is, allows that all Christians, of whatever sect or persuasion, may be saved.”

But the Greek church, the religion of many of the Russians, our allies, does not, in general, believe in the Trinity in the way in which the Creed of St. Athanasius expounds it; they are a most numerous and powerful nation, Christians, yet not professing that Catholic faith, which faith, according to St. Athanasius, and the English church (which admits his creed,) except every man keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlasting. That Creed is supposed to have been framed as an exclusive test against Arians; they, too, are Christians, so are the Socinians generally allowed to be, and the numerous sects to which these two heresies have given rise; yet Doctor Duigenan, L. L. D. positively says, the Protestant church allows, that all Christians, of whatsoever sect or persuasion, may be saved. Why is he so angry, page 174, with Lord Minto, for calling the Romanists, Catholics? If he allows them a chance of salvation, according to his own doctrine, they must believe in the Catholic faith, whole and undefiled, and consequently may be called

called Catholics. For the tenets of Calvinism upon the same subject, (see Calvin's Refutation of Servetus). Those of the Kirk of Scotland are contained in their confession of faith; ratified by Parliament, 1560: " Which Kirk is Catholic, that  
 " is, universal, because it containeth the elect of  
 " all ages; out of which Kirk there is neither life  
 " nor eternal felicity, and therefore we utterly  
 " abhor the blasphemy of them that affirm, that  
 " men, which live according to equity and justice,  
 " shall be saved, what religion that ever they have  
 " professed."

The truth is, that tenet which is so often objected to Roman Catholics, belongs more or less to all sects of the Christian religion; and it requires but little reflection to perceive, that it must, in a great degree, find its way into every sect which makes faith a condition of salvation. But this terrible tenet, like most other speculative opinions, has nothing in it either uncharitable or anti-social. It loses all its deformity when placed in a proper light. All Christian churches agree, that a person living in error, knowingly and against his conscience, will scarcely be saved; but all Christian churches agree also, that a person living in error unknowingly and conscientiously, will scarcely be damned.

How happy would it have been for mankind, what torrents of blood, what ages of misery would have been spared, if religion had never been mixed with politics, but by its maxims of universal charity and mutual forgiveness.

While the establishment of the reformation was doubtful in England, and the titles to the confiscated estates of the church, might be deemed precarious, these misrepresentations of the Roman Catholic faith, and the penal laws against the professors of it, might have had at least the excuse of political expediency. While the pretensions of the house of Stuart to the throne of England could be considered as dangerous, and that the Roman Catholic religion was deemed favourable to them, the same excuse might be alleged. Though Doctor Duigenan, p. 163, with a boldness beyond any other author of historical doubts, affirms, *passim.* that the Irish never were attached to the House of Stuart, and that the Catholic religion is not favourable to the cause of monarchy. Even as long as any doubt could remain about the titles to forfeited estates in Ireland, some plea might be made for this system, though many other modes of securing them might have been devised, better than putting three-fourths of the country under penal and restrictive laws.

But

But now that not one of these dangers exist ; and that we are threatened, from every side, by other dangers more formidable, such as call for the whole force and unanimity of the empire ; what reasons can be alleged for the continuation of a system which no circumstances require, and which evidently tends to weaken and divide our opposition to the greatest perils to which the world was ever exposed. As if the daily events of human life did not unfortunately produce sufficient occasion of strife and recrimination ; why will he force us, worn as we are by the dissensions of our own days, to return to those of Henry, of Elizabeth, and James, to seek for causes and precedents of hatred and mistrust ? establishing discord beyond the reach of prescription, least the lapse of happier ages might obliterate its effects upon mankind, and make the sons friends, though the fathers had been enemies. When will the temple of Janus be closed, if one face of the idol look, in the spirit of revenge, through every past age ; while the other, in the spirit of suspicion, penetrates through every age to come ; concentrating, in the little period of time we can call our own, every grievance of our ancestors, as far as history can reach ; and of our posterity, as far as imagination can wander ? were it not better to live among the most savage tribe, whose foresight extends not beyond the hour, nor their annals beyond

beyond unaided memory? Thank God, such times have little in common with those in which we live. What weak and mischievous man would think of arraigning the wisdom and humanity of the British Legislature, by raking from the dust, in which they are buried, the obsolete acts against witchcraft, conjuration, and the evocations of evil spirits, the ordeal trials, the decisions by combat, and many another weakness and superstition of times long posterior to those ages of universal darkness, through which he is obliged to grope his way, to get at something which he may object to the Roman Catholic religion; something to perpetuate dissension.

Page 31, Dr. Duigenan warns us against relying with too much confidence on the oaths of Roman Catholics, which operate against their religious opinions; but he has taken great pains to inform us, that their religious opinions extend to every transaction of public, and almost of private, life. Does he mean that their engagements, in the common occurrences of life, must not be trusted, like those of other people? or, that, the British nation must not rely upon the faith of Roman Catholic states? that none of the Imperialists, Spaniards, Portuguese, Italians, or Russians, whose creed is nearly the same, are, according to him, worthy of confidence? must not his Royal Highness the Duke of

of York trust the Archduke Charles of Austria? must Lord Nelson take Dr. Duigenan's word, and mistrust that of the King of Naples, or of Cardinal Rufo, because they are Roman Catholics? is it only our good fellow-Protestant the King of Prussia who never will deceive us? Was the oath of allegiance of our former fellow-subjects of America to be trusted, because they are Protestants? is that of the inhabitants of Canada to be mistrusted, because they are Roman Catholics?

In what a melancholy, isolated, position would he place us; more essentially distant, more widely separate, and cut off, from the rest of the civilized world, by the opinions which he would inculcate, than by the ocean that rolls between us.—*Penitus topo divisos orbe Britannos.*—Let England remain distinguished, as she is, among the nations of the earth, by her virtues, and by her spirit; not distinct, as he would have her, by her religious prejudices. What a miserable schism in society is he striving to create, not in Ireland only, but in the world? and to answer what end? Are these times to divide the friends of religion, and of government, into two parties, as much animated against each other as against their common enemy? What evidently appears to be meant, by, (page 41) of *the Case of Ireland Re-*

considered, to be as insulting to the religion of our allies, the first nations on the Continent of Europe, as the abominable oath of Hatred to Royalty, set up as a test in France, is to their form of government, is the declaration against trans-substantiation, the invocation of Page 183saints, the sacrifice of the mass, and the terms in which it is expressed. The word *abjuration* has been inadvertently used, by the author of that pamphlet, for *declaration against*, and has drawn upon him the reproach of contemptible ignorance of the laws of his country, see page 126, of *Fair Representation*. Has it not rather an uncourteous appearance, that an English general cannot lead a re-inforcement of a thousand men to general Melas, or mareschal Suwarrow, until he has made a public declaration, that, from the bottom of his heart, as he hopes to be believed, he is firmly convinced that the generals, and the armies which they command, and the courts to which they belong, follow an idolatrous and superstitious religion? one would imagine that to think so, without saying it, were enough to satisfy the conscience. To exclaim perpetually in the ears of the greatest nations of the Continent, who, with the aid of Great Britain, are endeavouring, at an immense expence of blood and treasure, to save their religion from the enemies of all religion, that they are fighting to support idolatry, superstition, cruelty, tyranny, treason, &c. as this author

author and a few others do, does not seem wise or decorous. Who would not imagine he was in the hall of the Jacobins, under the presidency of Fauchet, or Anacharsis Cloots; or rather stopped in the Fauxbourg St. Antoine, by the crowd, gathering around one of the ambulating apologists for the murder and pillage of the Roman Catholic church and its ministers? Is it to be believed, that the subversion of that church would be indifferent to the cause of Christianity itself?

In vain will the Doctor argue, that he speaks of Irish Roman Catholics: the doctrine of their church is the same through all the nations of the universe; all that Irish Roman Catholics believe and profess, they believe and profess: all the abuse he heaps upon them, for their belief, applies to all the others.

Not to fatigue my readers, by following the *Author of Fair Representation* through all his gross misconstructions of other people's arguments, but to meet him upon a fair statement of his own; if, as he says, from the nature of a commercial Page 26. country, the property of a nation will shift, and not in a very slow progression, from the Protestant to the Catholic; the bulk of property, as well as the mass of numbers, will certainly, not

at a very distant period, be formally excluded from any share in the representation of the country, except the privilege of voting for the men who exclude them, and of whom the laws and spirit of the country make a distinct class, with separate and even opposite interests. The most efficient branch of power, in the constitution of Ireland, will, at that period, which he says is not very distant, according to his own reasoning, be neither with the property, nor with the numbers of the country; but with certain religious opinions. The government will be a mixture of theocracy and monarchy. When not the possessor of a certain property, but the professor of a certain religion, can be the only representative, though property happens, at that precise time, to be with that religion; yet the principle of power and representation, resting in property, is abandoned. It is possible, on the principle he supports, that no man possessing any property in Ireland can hereafter be a representative in parliament for any part of Ireland. If, according to his other position, the Roman Catholics have not above one-fortieth of the property, and are not likely ever to have such a proportion as will carry any weight in the state; where is the danger of admitting them to a share in the representation, in proportion to the very small share of property which he says they can possess? if there

there be no danger, the expediency of attaching the great mass of population to the laws and government of the country, by that strong tie, the sense of individual interest, will not be denied.

The truth, I believe, lies between his two positions: they are neither so destitute of property, nor of the means of acquiring it, as he states on the one side; nor likely to acquire it by so rapid an accumulation, as he states on the other.

Would it not be better then, to admit them by degrees, and let their influence, in the state, shoot up gradually with their stake in it, and their consequent attachment to it; than either to keep the property and numbers of the country in a separate class unrepresented, or to protract, and admit them, all at once, with the great mass of property and numbers on their side, guided by the prejudices and contracted spirit of party, which naturally do, and ever must, arise among any set of men, kept long under partial restrictions, whether they be Protestants or Roman Catholics. He has stated some of the inconveniences which might arise, from the admission of Roman Catholics, very fairly; but he has, more often, recourse to his mere assertion, that all Roman Catholics are traitors and enemies to the state, (page 33) that they would always oppose his Majesty's

ministers ; and forget their own interest in the state, to join any set of profligate desperadoes. But he has past over in silence the very great and manifest mischiefs which have arisen, and still exist, by the present system of exclusion. That there are inconveniences on both sides, no one, that knows Ireland, will deny. Great and insuperable inconveniences as they appear to my mind, in excluding expressly, from their fair share in the constitution of their country, so large a mass of property and of people ; shutting them out, in a great measure, from the common interests of the state ; subjecting them to the influence of prejudice and party, which, from the nature of things, must exist among them, under such circumstances : creating, not as he affects to fear, an *imperium in imperio*, but *another nation amidst the nation* ; and erecting a barrier against that assimilation of ideas, even of religious ideas, which an assimilation of interests cannot fail to create. As strong and as insuperable inconveniences as they appear to my mind, in thus perpetuating the prejudices and party spirit, which as naturally and as violently seize the minds of those, to whose profit this exclusion is to be maintained ; which, in every state, will be found as dangerous, and as troublesome to government, as the former ; and will never cease, while its cause exists. Less inconvenience, in admitting the majority of the inhabitants,

inhabitants, even with the prejudices and party spirit in which their political situation, not their religion, has involved them, but which every day, that breaks under a fairer system, will diminish; less inconvenience, in admitting them to the fair share of the constitution which their fellow-subjects enjoy; in the slow and safe proportion of their increasing property, under the strong and vigilant control of a Protestant King, a Protestant house of Peers, and the most powerful nation in Europe, also Protestant. Is the innovation, talked of, in the British constitution, in admitting property, in this manner, to representation? or in excluding it? which is most foreign to the spirit of the constitution? When the price paid for the benefits of the constitution was less felt, men might be less sensible of the inconvenience and humiliation of exclusion; but, at present, that it requires every effort of industry and economy to support it; to pay as much and more than other people do, and to have no chance of the same benefits, is very hard.

No arrangement which my imagination can suggest, either with or without an Union, will, in my weak opinion, remedy the former inconvenience; the evident cause of the distressed state of this country. The latter can be avoided only by making every distinction, even what appears most trivial between the

the two religions, as imperceptible as possible, and the common interest as strong. The slightest partial distinctions in a state are productive of the most extensive mischief. It is not so much the things themselves, from which Roman Catholics are excluded, as the humiliating idea of exclusion which afflicts them.

It is becoming the magnanimity of a great nation to consult the feelings of its subjects.

Let us smooth away the few remaining differences, pity and enlighten superstition when we meet it; treat it as a weakness, not as a crime; bear its excesses with as much forbearance as we can; correct them with all the severity, but with all the justice of the laws; and let no aggression provoke us to descend from the dignity of government to an imitation of what we so justly abhor.

Obliterate old animosities, follow the sublime example of the first states which the world ever beheld, let no trophy or party badge, no monument perpetuate the memory of civil victories,—extinguish party spirit in the spirit of the country, till by, perhaps, a slow but a sensible and sure progression, population will emerge from its semi-barbarous state, and the common interest become paramount to all other considerations.

The

The frequent repetition of Jacobin, Deist, Atheist, and the other abusive terms which this Author thinks it becoming to use, embarrasses argument, merely for the sake of proving that he is angry. If he cannot refrain from such language, as some men cannot from the bad habit of swearing, it would be better to make it a seperate partition of discourse, and allot a sheet or more to it at the beginning or end of his work. If the public care at all about what authors say, it is not about what they say of one another.

If, as Dr. Duigenan objects, there be any laws Page 31. which the conscience of a Roman Catholic may forbid him to execute in the state, (I know of none) let his conscience also forbid him to accept the trust. If he take it upon him and do not execute it, whatever may be his situation, he is amenable to the laws for neglect of duty.

*Irish Romanists are almost universally determined* Page 34. *Republicans.* We must wait until he has fulfilled his promise of proving it. Has he so soon forgot that too great a partiality to Monarchical power was the standing crime which used to be objected to them?

His answer to the second argument, that Ro- Page 36. man Catholics have a right to seats in parliament in

in proportion to their property, because property is, by the British constitution, the basis of representation, is not a good specimen of logical deduction. It is simply this, without an attempt at farther proof or higher authority than his own words: “ *A class* of people, the determined enemies of the state, traitors in theory, and always in practice when they dare, be their property what it may, cannot be proved by any force of argument to have a right to be admitted into the supreme legislative power of the state. They ought to be excluded by every principle on which civil societies are founded. Therefore, Roman Catholics have no right to seats in parliament according to their property.” Q. E. D.

Page 36. They are, as he advises them to be, very thankful for being permitted to remain within the territories of the state, and to enjoy its protection. But it was considered as an ungracious compliment of Cicero to Mark Anthony to thank him for not killing him. Though to receive justice as a favour may be prudent, to return thanks for it as such is disparaging, and still more so to require it. Notwithstanding his friendly advice, their veneration and love of the British constitution, of King, Lords, and Commons, and that true principle of it, taxation, and representation, will ever prompt the Roman Catholics

tholics of Ireland to solicit legally and respectfully, and with confidence in the justice of their King and fellow-subjects, an equal share in its advantages, as they will ever be ready to take an equal share in the toil of maintaining, or the danger of defending it. Neither slander nor menace will move them from that line of intrepid and persevering moderation, which reason and duty have traced as far within the bounds of law, as charity has within those of social intercourse. Were they to pursue any other mode of conduct, might not their indifference, in times like these, be construed into disaffection? might they not be suspected, either of not thinking a share in the British constitution worth seeking or of seeking it else where than in the justice of Britons? But no arts of interested men shall tease them into apprehensions, that the humble and just remonstrances of millions of their fellow-subjects, whose complaints are almost within their hearing, will ever be received with fastidious indifference by that august assembly, in which the most miserable native of the remotest region of Africa has found such zealous and eloquent defenders. Among them, as often as the feelings of human nature have been interested, the distinctions of political party have disappeared. In their even balance, no ascendancy will turn the scale against the ascendancy of justice; no part preponderate beyond the whole.

All English and Irish statesmen and senators, in the reign of Henry VIII. Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and ever since, Doctor Duigenan assures us, have supported the idea, “*That the most numerous religious sect in Ireland, not acknowledging the supremacy of the state, but professing to be subject to a foreign jurisdiction, their religion could not be established without destroying the constitution which is founded on the principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, and the exclusion of foreign interference and jurisdiction.*” He then informs us, that the petulance of the Author of the *Case of Ireland Re-considered*, and the education which he supposes him to have had among French philosophers, the only rival of whose characteristic presumption is their ignorance, have prompted him to say, that he could not understand how any well-informed man could repeat this objection twice.

Here a good deal of attention is required, for now that the manly sense and impartial justice of Britons have discarded from their senate-house the trivial tales of Pope Joan, the Scarlet Whore, and Anti-Christ, as motives for taxation or disqualification of its subjects, it is the only ground left for them. It must long ago have been observed, that every argument in this book of the Doctor’s, and in most others on the same side, consists of this assertion in different shapes, and every difficulty that comes in their way is resolved by

by taking this assertion as proved or admitted. Had Dr. Duigenan been able to prove it, he need have said no more; reasoning would be very short if its principles were adhered to. His first foundation is a false and mutilated quotation of the oath of Roman Catholic titular Bishops, where he inserts what they are ordered to leave out, and leaves out what they are ordered to insert; his next, as we have seen, an unsupported assertion; his third, after having employed what he means to prove twenty times in the course of his argument as conceded, is a personal abuse of his opponent, and an appeal to the wisdom of statesmen and senators of Great Britain and Ireland, from the time of Henry VIII. to our days. But, on the other hand, the great men of England, and Ireland, before that period, and the statesmen, senators, and divines, of most parts of Europe, both before and ever since, maintain; and the examples I have produced above, and the whole body of history are proofs, *that nothing in the Roman Catholic religion is incompatible with a constitution founded on the principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty.* That there exists no interference of temporal power seems to be allowed on all sides. It has been premised too, and I think proved, or most certainly it may be proved, that spiritual power has nothing to do with the question; and that ecclesiastical power, properly understood, derives only from the state. The portion of temporal

power which the state allows to the church, seems to constitute what is meant by its being established; and so far the unity of religion appears necessary to the state; but, to receive a stipend from the state, at will, without any temporal power, does not convey the idea of establishment. But as this last seems not sufficiently distinct, in our mind, from spiritual supremacy, it was often repeated in that pamphlet, that some reasonable objections might be made to, and some inconveniences arise from, allowing any thing like a church-establishment to Roman Catholics in England and Ireland, especially with any thing of temporal power and honour; but none in admitting Roman Catholic subjects to every other share in the legislature, according to their rank or property; especially in the relative situation of Ireland and England: on the contrary, great advantage would accrue to the tranquillity and strength of the former, and to its Protestant church-establishment, which would be equally secure, without the support of those exclusive laws, which have done such harm to the country, and kept both establishment and property in a precarious and unsettled state. This opinion receives great additional force, even with those who cannot take the trouble of investigating the clear and positive facts on which it rests, when we reflect, that the statesmen and senators of the reigns of Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, were

passing their judgement upon a faith they had but recently abjured, of whose tenets they might be ignorant, or which they might even misrepresent, from a secret bias natural to the mind in controversy, of which itself is scarcely conscious; that these too were times of violent contention all over Europe, in which a fair opinion is scarcely to be expected from either of the contending parties. That the others, (the statesmen and senators of other countries or other times,) men of most respectable abilities, many of them removed from the contest, spoke of what they believed and professed, and were bound to represent fairly and conscientiously. But, more than all, when we hear the descendants of those British and Irish statesmen and senators he alludes to, men as respectable for their integrity, as admirable for their abilities, as pure in their patriotism as any of their ancestors, uttering unequivocally, very different opinions, in a language more conformable to Christian charity, which the spirit of religious party has ceased to suspend every where but in one <sup>Page 30.</sup> unhappy island; and we cannot easily be brought to believe with the Doctor, that the wisdom of those days was greater than what exists in our times. When every art and science depending upon the operations of the human mind has made a considerable progress, how can we believe that the human mind itself has been retrograde?

Lord

Page 30. Lord Chesterfield, whose opinions he also presses into his service, is most undoubtedly, as he says, above the suspicion of narrow or illiberal sentiments. But on some occasions it may be observed, that this nobleman was more remarkable for the polish, than for the depth of his understanding. That pity which, on the occasion Dr. Duigenan quotes, he affects to entertain for those who choose to believe in the tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, must be extended to all those great men of the age of Louis XIV. and of his own times, of whom he professes himself the constant and almost exclusive admirer. It is strange that their faculties should be so transcendent on all other subjects, such mere objects of his pity on this alone—That he who knew mankind so well, should pity the weak minds of Richelieu, of Mazarin, or of Choiseul. But of all men, since the days of Arristippus, Lord Chesterfield has been celebrated for the elegant pliancy with which he knew how to adapt his manners, his language, perhaps sometimes too his sentiments, to the persons he addressed.

The dangerous tendency of the opinions of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to which he adverts, is undeniably their attachment at that period, to the old race of their monarchs. Their love of monarchy has ever been their chief reproach. If the

the Roman Catholic religion interferes at all with politics, it is to inculcate, to subjects, as a moral and religious duty, respect and attachment to the settled forms of government under which they live.

The writ for burning Heretics is shocking to humanity; the laws for burning witches are shocking and humiliating to human nature: but I for one do not partake of the Doctor's apprehensions of seeing either the one or the other revived in any civilized country, unless the violence and infatuation of party spirit drives mankind back once more into that pitiable state of ignorance, prejudice, and barbarity, from which dear bought experience, and a tedious succession of ages, have scarcely redeemed us.

There may appear some ignorance, but I can <sup>Page 37.</sup> find no malice, although he accuses the author of the pamphlet of both, in saying that the Roman Catholics do not deny the power of the state to manage the concerns, establishment, faith, and discipline, of the Church of England. If it had pleased him, in his *Fair Representation*, not to mutilate the phrase, but to have quoted it fairly and honestly, with what is contained in the same number of it, without even the separation of a comma,   
 viz.

Page 42. *viz.*—With all the authority their Bishops may  
 Case of Ireland. possess, he never would have appeared to any one  
 but the Doctor to have asserted, that the faith and  
 discipline of the Church of England were *mere  
 creatures of state policy, not founded and regu-  
 lated by the revealed word of God.* Is it not  
 evident that, by the state which comprehends the  
 temporal power of Bishops as Peers, and by all the  
 authority which the Prelates of the Church of  
 England may possess besides, in contradistinction  
 to their temporal power, was meant to be expressed  
 what was conceived to be the supreme power un-  
 der God, of the Church of England. Where is  
 there the malicious sneer at the Established Church?  
 Is it consistent with fair and honest representation  
 to leave out so essential a member of a phrase,  
 and then draw an insidious consequence from a  
 Page 37. broken part of it.?

Page 40. The comparison of the case of Ireland and of  
 compar-  
 son of Scotland, as to religion, in different parts of the  
 Scotland. *Case of Ireland reconsidered,* notwithstanding the  
 Doctor's insults, appears to be correct, in as much  
 as he himself informs us, that Scotland struggled  
 with difficulty against episcopacy, which James I.  
 endeavoured to introduce, until about nineteen  
 years before the Union. That during that strug-  
 gle to introduce a religion in spite of the attach-  
 ment of the most numerous portion of its inhabi-  
 tants

tants to another creed. Scotland underwent all the misfortunes he describes Ireland, (page 54,) as labouring under from the same cause ; “ the attachment of a considerable portion of its inhabitants to their religion, in opposition to that of the Church of England, which the state endeavoured to introduce ;” and Scotland too might this day have remained another melancholy proof of the effects of such a system, if the people had not been allowed, wisely and humanely, to remain in quiet possession of their opinions. Presbyterianism was, a few years after, acknowledged by the Treaty of Union to be the religion of Scotland, though episcopacy was that of England. Now I appeal to any well-informed man, does not the Roman Catholic church, in its discipline and in its general political tendency, come nearer than Presbyterianism to the Church of England ? I ask also any unprejudiced man, whether he really believes, if England, instead of yielding judiciously to the tried opinion of the great mass of people in Scotland, had persevered in her endeavours to force upon them her own religion, and had subjected non-conformers, who were the great majority of that nation, to penalties and disqualifications, that Scotland would this day be a country as settled and as thriving as we see it, and the Union attended with such happy circumstances ? Whether he really believes that if

the same indulgence had been shewn to the opinions of its inhabitants an hundred years ago, with every guarantee and safe-guard from England for the Protestant establishment, Ireland would this day be in the state Dr. Duigenan describes?

Page 41. Presbyterianism was the established religion of Scotland at the time of the Union, because he tells

Page 47. us the mass of the people opposed any other. But it was so only for a short time, eighteen or nineteen years before; since he tells us, the struggle lasted till the revolution, and much jealousy and distrust between the two religions still existed at that very period.

The argument then, not by any means for the establishment, as he chooses to assert, (in absolute contradiction to all that is advanced in the *Case of Ireland reconsidered,*) but for a total toleration, and a real not a verbal adoption of the Roman Catholics of Ireland into all the civil advantages of the state, is this.

As Scotland at the Union retained the religion of the great mass of its people, which had been established a few years before, in opposition to England, as he says, and as both countries have been benefited by this concession; therefore Ireland, by its Treaty of Union, might

might be allowed, to retain without any disqualifications, the religion of the great mass of its people, not in opposition to, but with the consent and through the humanity, wisdom, and justice of England and Ireland; not to the exclusion of the Church of England, as of episcopacy in Scotland; but leaving and confirming to that church for ever, the whole of its ecclesiastical property under the management of the state; not with any establishment of temporal rights or advantages for the Roman Catholic church; but with equal civil rights and advantages for its members; which alone can be called complete toleration. Unless upon a fair examination, divested of all party spirit, and with a sincere desire of terminating religious dissensions, restrictions were deemed absolutely necessary. Such an arrangement would probably produce the same good effect as it did in the case of Scotland, since the want of it has produced and prolonged the same misfortunes. This is the fair way of stating the argument deduced from Scotland.

I pass over the accusations of ignorance and fraud. The Roman Catholics of Ireland do, as their ancestors did on the occasions I have already cited, disclaim as much as the followers of the Church of England, or as the Presbyterians, all partnership of dominion within the realm between the state and any foreign power.

Page 43. If the statement of this book of the Doctor's then be just, and this be the *cardinal point on which all political authority and legitimate government rest in the British empire*, not only the two, but the three churches are so far from being in opposition, that there exists between them the most perfect harmony. Let an oath be framed; a simple, fair, and honest pledge between man and man, expressing, in the strongest sense which words can be made to convey, the duty of a subject to his sovereign, and to his country, as strong a renunciation of all foreign interference, temporal, or ecclesiastical, or spiritual, so as to be enforced by any civil act, affecting life or property, or any other temporal interest whatsoever, without the consent of the state as above explained; let it imply no more, and he that will not take it, will not complain of being excluded from his fair share in a free state.

Page 12. The Doctor would insinuate, that Roman Catholics object to the whole of the oath of supremacy. It is not true. How useless soever it may seem for them to abjure doctrines which they never thought of professing, let the words, authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, be explained as they may be, and Roman Catholics will not object to the oath of supremacy.

In page 40, of *Fair Representation*, he says, it is obvious the Roman Catholics are not excluded from parliament, as the Author of the *Case of Ireland*

*Ireland ignorantly states*, by their not admitting the King to be the supreme head of the church; but, in page 113, of the pamphlet said to contain the *Substance of the Debate of the 4th of May, 1795*, the following words are given, as Dr. Duigenan's, among his reasons for excluding them: *The Roman Catholics absolutely deny the supremacy of the King, and state, in all ecclesiastical concerns.* It was this assertion, of Dr. Duigenan himself, that the Author, of the *Case of Ireland Reconsidered*, appears to have had in view, when he advances, that they do not deny the supremacy of the King, and state, over the church of England.

That to the simple pledge of their loyalty and allegiance, should be tacked any dubious expression, which might wound the conscience, or appear to place them in an insidious and unnecessary dilemma between the God whom they adore, and the King whom that God commands them to reverence and obey; and that, to be put on the same footing of civil rights and advantages as their fellow-subjects, they should be obliged to abjure any speculative opinion, having nothing to do with the business of this world; is what they most humbly represent as a grievance.

If there be any degree of liberty of which, one would imagine, the most despotic state would not  
I  
be

be jealous, it is the liberty of thought; if there be any degree of liberty which, one would imagine, the most jealous state would regard with indifference, it is the manifestation of thought, by words or actions which have no concern with the laws or the authority of the state. The liberality of the church of England puts the sacred writings into the hands of all its members. But with what danger is that liberty attended, if to interpret certain passages, in a certain manner, will subject them to such severe disqualifications and penalties? if the first law-officer, for example, or the learned Doctor himself, suffers a devout imagination to lead him into a temporary belief, that the intercession of departed saints may avail at the great tribunal; can he, with a safe conscience, keep his place a day longer?

They conceive, that amidst a people more universally informed than any other which ever existed, whose minds are accustomed to the strict reasoning of a Newton, a Locke, an Adam Smith, and of so many other great political writers, who have reduced the principles of government almost to mathematical precision; it never can, if the least attention be given to the subject, be assigned as a reason of taxation or exclusion of any of their fellow-subjects, that they believe in transubstantiation, or any other

specu-

speculative opinion, at least, indifferent to the state. If any other dangerous doctrines are supposed to be attached to this belief, it would be wise and merciful to substitute those doctrines, in the test of exclusion, in the place of those opinions which no man can say have any bad political tendency.

The position, that every state ought to establish the religious sect which is most numerous, is not from the pamphlet the Doctor attacks, but taken from that which it attempts to answer; and it is there given merely as an opinion of modern authors. It certainly is assented to, supposing religion to be meant for the comforts of mankind, and presuming that no form of it, long established in any civilized nation, can be essentially bad. But whether it be assented to in a way to justify his conclusions, in his *Fair Representation*, page 47, the comparison of the texts will shew. There is something very mechanical in the operations of the brain; touch but one fibre, and it wakes the whole train of ideas with which it is used to be coupled: the sound of establishment at once calls out, in some minds, glebe, tythe-proctors, and vicars-general:

—Should I go to church,  
And see the holy edifice of stone,  
And not bethink me strait of dangerous rocks,

Which,

Which, touching but my gentle vessel's side,  
Would scatter all her spices in the stream,  
Enrobe the roaring waters with my silks,  
And, in a word,—but now worth this—  
And now, worth nothing.—

*Merchant of Venice.*

But his fears will be lulled, if he takes the trouble to read, once more, the words of his own book, and those of the pamphlet.

He lays it down as a position, the truth of which cannot be disputed, that Popery ought to be established, by the Irish government, and the revenues of the church applied to the support of Popish priests; that the Protestant Establishment must and ought to be destroyed, and Popery placed in its room; and that it would be both wise and generous, for the government, to appropriate part of it, at least, to the support (that is establishment) of Irish Roman priests.

He then argues, the state may justly refuse any support to the ministers of the established church.

The Roman Catholics cannot have, and do not pretend to, any claim upon it (the revenue enjoyed by the church, in the same sentence); and I admit, with the Author of *Arguments for and against*, &c. that, if the government, out of its wisdom or generosity, offers a portion of it as a stipend to their pastors, as there exists neither right nor obligation on either side, conditions may be attached to what is freely given.

Not in *the Case of Ireland*, nor to be inferred from it.

No such argument or infinuation in any part of the pamphlet; the direct contrary constantly asserted.

Again,

Again,

One of which proofs of ignorance, &c. is his doctrine respecting the inexpediency of a church-establishment, and the justice of the confiscation of all church-revenue.

Page 47, *Fair Representation.*

But if another modern political principle be adopted, that a state should not have any religious establishment, &c.

Page 40, *Cate of Ireland.* Dublin Edition.

How can he accuse his antagonist of supporting two opinions so contradictory and incompatible? First, that the Protestant establishment should be given to the Roman Catholic; and, secondly, that there should be no establishment: first, of aiming at the subversion of all governments and religions; secondly, of proposing to rebuild the *gaudy palace of Romish tyranny and usurpation, in alliance with the Atheists of France.*

I ask every impartial reader, if he has ever met an example of worse reasoning, both in matter and form, either according to the rules of the school, or of common sense, than is contained in *Fair Representation*, from page 47 to page 52.

When he argues upon the statements of his opponent, I have just shewn how he quotes them.

Page 48, What has the usurpation of part of the sovereignty of the state, or the translation of it to a foreign power, or the abdication of it by government, to do with the argument, unless they are first proved to be included in some part of the proposition?

Page 48. The poor exceed the rich in number; they universally wish for a division of the property of the wealthy: yet the laws for an equal division of property, real and personal, of the nature of Agrarian laws, are held to be destructive of all states. Property, its acquisition, and preservation, act as powerfully on the passions and prejudices of the people, in general, as religion. Therefore, political writers might as well maintain that laws for the equal division of property should be enacted by the state, as that it should establish that sect of religion whose votaries, among its subjects, are most numerous. How ingeniously is the turbulent and momentary wish of the poor majority, for a division of the wealth of the rich few, put upon the same footing as the long-tried and steady wish of a people for the unmolested enjoyment of their religious opinions: their unreasonable attack upon the rights of others, assimilated to their reasonable wish of enjoying, without inconvenience, their own rights, which their religious opinions may justly be called! I say,

say, in the first instance, momentary, because though the wish may exist, the principle, of the unqualified division of the property of the wealthy, never was, nor can be, maintained, by any set of people, for any length of time. The principle defeats itself, as soon as it is put in practice. It is evidently a cause where every conqueror must necessarily become a deserter; the same motive which drove them to it, must drive them from it.

Through the whole of his book, he takes for granted, and reasons upon what, if he could prove his whole book, would be needless, that, *the Roman Catholic religion is destructive of the state, &c. &c.* But another very material error is, this; he takes also for granted, that the same rule is Page 48. to be applied to religion as to political power; yet the very inverse seems to take place. Political power, in a free state, as we all agree, should be distributed, as it is in the British constitution, in proportion to property. The protection of property is one of the great ends of civilized society, and those who have some interest in it are the best judges how it is to be protected: but in religion, all are equally concerned, as they are in cases of life and death; the most illiterate men, therefore, by the laws of England, are allowed to be judges in those highly-important cases, because they come as much home to their feelings as to those of men

better educated. Their existence in a future state, also, comes home to the feelings of the meanest class. If they are very positive in their opinion, that they can secure their eternal welfare but in one way; and if during more than a century, not the rigour of law, nor the mild persuasive persevering charity of the pastors of another religion, nor all the advantages held out to them by the state, have been able to destroy that conviction; is it very unreasonable to say, that the state ought to allow them that way of saving their souls in the next world, without depriving of them on that account of any civil advantage in this?

Surely religion, its comforts, (I do not mean its temporal establishments) and its instructions, ought to be provided where they are most wanted; which is not generally in the class of property, but among, what the Doctor calls, the mob and rabble. To them religion is education, as to the others education is, in a great degree, religion. Simplicity and humility are the sublime characteristics of the Gospel of Christ: it does not disdain the beggary of the nation; it was preached to the poor; it suits its precepts to their understanding, till, by persuasion, confidence, and perseverance, it suits them to its most elevated doctrines: it teaches us to submit our reason to our faith; but the unbounded charity which it inculcates, enlightens our reason, and guards us against the sophisms

sophisms of selfishness. Page 71, is an argument against consulting the religion of the majority if they happen to be poor.

“ The Roman Catholic religion is the religion Page 71.  
 “ of the majority, two to one. But property is in  
 “ the hands of the Protestants, forty to one: so that  
 “ it may justly be asserted, from fair calculation,  
 “ exclusive of its being the one established, that  
 “ the religion of the people of Ireland is Pro-  
 “ testant, though the people of Ireland two to one  
 “ are Catholics.”

I do not see any great inconvenience, leaving political power to property, that religion should be suited to numbers, keeping temporal power and religion as separate as possible. Numbers are taken here either absolutely or relatively. Is there any good reason to be given, that a Parish in Connaught, with one hundred Roman Catholics and one Protestant, should be without a pastor, because in Yorkshire there are a hundred parishes without one Catholic?

Though a religion, with an establishment, may Page 50.  
 be too good a thing for two millions of Irish subjects, *so poor*, (page 50,) *as not to be able to pay a tax of fourpence a head to the state, and for the whole beggary of the kingdom*, as he seems to imply

ply (though page 63, he says their poverty is exaggerated by the Author of *the Case of Ireland Re-considered*,) yet in found policy it will be acknowledged, they ought to have some religion, and if they absolutely refuse to listen to one, after every trial has been made for centuries to persuade, or force them to it, would it not be better to allow them another, even at a little expence, if necessary, than to adopt the modern French doctrine, and leave them without any, which from the scarcity of parish priests, the expence, and many inconveniences of the present situation of the religion of the poor may very soon be the case. The Clergy of the Church of England, in general gentlemen of education and learning, are few of them in the habits of living with the common people of Ireland; few of them speak their language. I believe it will be admitted, that the peasantry of Ireland would be in a worse state, even than they are, if they had no priests and no religion. For that reason it is asserted, in *the Case of Ireland Re-considered*, that the great end of religion, the amelioration of the state of the poor in point of comfort and instruction, was answered in Ireland, without an establishment. Perhaps, if the members of that church were asked, what could be done for them, they would answer like the French merchants to Colbert: Let us alone. Though the author of

hat pamphlet draws upon himself very heavy animadversions, for saying he conceived the parliament of Ireland might make any disposition of the revenue of the church, which in their wisdom they thought would best fulfil the ends for which the church was endowed with it, the comfort, the instruction, the civilization, of the great mass of its people; yet this (in fair and honest representation) cannot be said to be arguing for the justice of *confiscating all the church revenue*. I understand the Roman Catholic clergy have no wish whatever for an establishment. In the pamphlet it is observed, it should be offered and accepted with great caution. It may hurt the already declining confidence of the people in their pastors, whom they will look upon as pensioners. It may open a field for mean interests to work upon. It may renew obsolete disputes about investitures, and confound two powers now happily quite distinct.

Let the Doctor, then, calm his fears for the church-establishment, for which, though not in quite such courtly language, he pleads with all the eloquence of Cicero, *pro domo sua*.

Tithes are not in Ireland much more popular Page 56. than taxes, therefore, through a very common mistake, to have given them that appellation does not deserve the reproach of intentionally exposing them

to the odium of the people. Most writers upon political economy agree, that in some instances they bear hard upon the industry of the poor, and harder in proportion to their industry, though an allowance be made for them in rent; that they sometimes are an unequal burden; the profit being in very different proportions, in different circumstances, to the gross produce upon which they are levied; so much so, that in lands lately brought into culture, even beyond the operation of the act, which exempts them from tithe for a certain time, it is possible that tithe strictly levied might engross nearly the whole profit. The question of tithe is now very well understood, and the opinion of very great statesmen upon the subject, pretty generally known. I leave it to those who know Ireland, to determine whether tithes have or have not at various times caused discontent or disturbance in many of its provinces, especially in the south. The Doctor admits, that both Roman Catholics and Dissenting Protestants pay them with great reluctance.

Page 62. There was at first sight something of fairness in the argument, that it could not be considered as a hardship for the Roman Catholic poor man to pay tithe to the Protestant clergyman, whose doctrines he did not hear, (though like the crane in the fable, he was invited to the feast of which he could not partake page 61,) because tithes forty-nine parts

parts out of fifty were paid *out of the pocket* of the Protestant landlord; and that on the contrary, for the same reason it would be a hardship to turn any part of them to any other use but that of the Protestant clergy. But the Doctor, like Saturn, devouring his own children, combats most victoriously this argument of his own. In no part of this *Fair Representation* is his style more animated, more nervous, or more brilliant, the position more solid, nor the consequence more sensible, than when maintaining the transcendent dignity of tithes, this vicar general of Armagh, of Meath, of Dublin, of Ferns and Leighlin, and of Elphin, informs us, that they are a rent with which all the lands of the kingdom are chargeable from time immemorial, by the common law of the realm; that the clergy have been endowed with them by a title more ancient by ages than the title of any subject of this or any other kingdom in Europe, to his particular landed estate. They are not then paid out of the pocket of the Protestant landlord, as in page 212, he asserts, but are a distinct fund belonging to the church, by a title older than that of any Protestant or Catholic to his land.

Therefore, to give a provision out of them (if ever such a measure was thought of) would not, as he says, page 212, be compelling Irish Protestant landlords to support Popish priests; for, according

cording to him, tithe never did belong either to Protestant or Roman Catholic landlords; unless, for it is hard to seize this Proteus reasoner, the clergy are instantly transformed into the Protestant landlords of the tithes. At least they are not the landlords of page 212, and page 62, who pay them really and *bona fide* out of their pockets. But the Doctor writes professedly with a view of *opening the eyes of the British nation*. Few men, in times so ancient as those he refers to, inherited even their patrimonial estates without some condition of service. Whether any condition was attached to tithes when the church was endowed with them lies more in the learned Doctor's way than in mine to know. Tithes date much higher than the Reformation, they were paid for ages before the churches were separated, consequently it is not unfair to look for their institution and intention in those days. I never heard that the charitable appropriation of them was among the abuses that had crept into the Catholic Church.

The Council of Nantes, in the 7th century, in its tenth canon upon tithes, says, tithes are the stipend of the poor, and of the man without a home (*perigrinorum et hospitum*) the clergy should not look upon them as a property, but as a trust.

'The seventh letter of Charlemagne, in the ninth century, illustrates this doctrine. "Whether the apostles, who received their mission from Christ, ever insisted on the levying of tithes, is worth consideration. We know that a tenth part of our property, is a very valuable thing; but it is better to lose your tithes, than to lose the faith; for if we who were born, bred, and educated in the Catholic faith scarcely consent that a tithe should be strictly levied upon our substance, how will their weak faith, uninformed mind, and avaricious spirit consent to the exactation of it?"'

See Council of London, 1342, canon 4th. *Synodus Exoniensis*, 1287, cap. 18 *et licet ecclesiastici, &c. Pro ecclesiæ et Republicæ necessitate. Ecclesiæ bona pauperum patrimonia. Eorumque dispensatores non domini clerici censebantur.* This doctrine, confirmed by many English synods, was always admitted in Roman Catholic countries.

Tithes are there supposed to be allotted to the maintenance of the pastor, the repair of the church, and the relief of the poor.\* Tithe is re-

\* In Spain, the proportion of the poor, which they have a right to claim, is one third. In England, the revenues of the church, as well what remains to it as what has been confiscated to the benefit of private families were exempted

solvable into the rent of land, and the produce of labour. The part which is rent, belongs to the church, by an older title than that by which any landlord holds his estate; no matter what his religion is, he has nothing to do with it. The part which is labour belongs also to the church, by the same title, and is paid not out of the pocket, but out of the sweat of the brow of the poor. Suppose it instituted for the maintenance of the pastor, the repair of the church, the relief of the poor. The poor of Ireland are almost all Roman Catholics; therefore, though they are far from pretending any right to it, might they not at least say, that it would not be unreasonable, nor unjust, nor a hardship, if the government deemed it expedient, that a part of the tithe were allotted to the decent maintenance of their pastor, the repair of their miserable chapel, especially where there is no *Church*, a very common case, and that some relief should be given them by establishing an easy modus for the perception of it.

To this, the only answer I can collect from the Doctor's train of reasoning is, that *traitors always*, *empted* from this particular claim; but the poor of England have a revenue equal to that of three of the smaller kingdoms of Europe.

*in theory and in practice, when they dare, ought not to have pastors, nor decent places of worship, nor relief for their poor; or perhaps by a rule of political arithmetic he may prove, the Catholic poor, though ten to one, are not the poor of Ireland, because the property fifty to one is in the hands of the Protestants, in the same manner as he has already proved, that the religion of two to one is not the religion of the people of the country.*

Upon his details of the late rebellion, very few observations shall be made. It is not in the history of actual rebellion which has generally the same features, and must necessarily always be put down, whatever may have occasioned it, but in the transactions which preceded it, that we are to seek political instruction. Where no military skill can be displayed, the account of battles, massacres, and executions, is uninteresting and disgusting. Whoever means to write an useful history of that event, must take into his view the spirit of Irish government for many years back, with the late changes in the opinions of mankind, and begin from the year 86 or 87, the transactions in the county of Armagh, the origin of the peep of day boys, the defenders, and of the united Irishmen; the principles of their association, to what set of men, and what province they were long confined, the spirit and conduct of the Catholics in the south,

south, when the French first appeared off their coast; the administration of Lord Fitzwilliam, and of Lord Camden.

What is the use of that constant tone of exultation, in which he proclaims that the late rebellion was put down by Irish Protestant yeomen and Irish Protestant militia? Does he not tell us, page 34, that the lower orders, and particularly the peasantry, are almost all Roman Catholics? We know that the militia is taken by lot from among the lower orders, and the peasantry; and yet, page 6, he talks to us of the Irish Protestant militia. While his instructions to the English nation are conveyed in this manner, at least they will do no harm. <sup>Page 224.</sup> He will indeed fulfil his mission, he *will open their eyes.*

Is there a man so ill informed as not to know, so prejudiced as not to allow, that both in the yeomanry and militia there is, and must be, of necessity, a very great number of Roman Catholic officers and soldiers?

But suppose it otherwise, why is this author so anxious to place us in a state of menace, of defiance, of mistrust, of mutual hatred and ill will? To what end the perpetual taunting boast, that the Protestants with their own power can always sub-  
due

due the Catholics; that they only require the assistance of England, in case their countrymen should be joined by the common enemy. In time of peace, when you can spare your troops, we can do without them; but in time of war, when you want them, we must have them to support our pretensions, and our ascendancy over our fellow subjects. I remember, and so does he, a prouder boast in Ireland, when after manning armies and fleets for the empire abroad, left to her own spirit and exertions at home, she bade defiance to all the combined enemies of Great Britain. Unanimity, loyalty, and zeal for the common interest were the immediate effects of a momentary suspension of a religious prejudice. These dispositions might have been improved. The situation of Ireland might have been very different from what it now is. We have every reason to think it will be so, in spite of those who endeavour to prolong the disunion of her inhabitants. We will not resemble the Greeks, at Constantinople, who were disputing about the nature of the light on Mount Tabor, at the transfiguration of Christ, while the Turks were scaling their walls. The power of the Protestants of Ireland, their independence of England, and their bravery may be just as Dr. Duigenan describes them. Yet it does not appear to me that it is rendering them a great service,

service, who possess the wealth of the country, to reduce them to a permanent state of garrison duty over twice their number of their fellow-subjects,

Page 121. who are, as he assures them, *ever thirsting after their blood*. In this manner does he enhance to the British nation, the value of a connection with Ireland. This is the boasted offer of strength and assistance to the sister kingdom, his counterpoise in the scale of union. Not three or four millions of loyal and zealous subjects, with the wealth of the country, and the emoluments and advantages of a free government, circulating in a fair proportion among them, attached to the common cause, by their individual interest, but two millions of *blood-thirsty traitors*, *allying superstition to treason, and sanctifying rebellion*,

Page 96. with one million of Protestants keeping guard over them, strong enough to keep them down in time of peace, when the empire does not want their strength; but too weak to do it in time of war, when the troops of the empire must be employed not to annoy the common enemy, but to maintain the Protestants of Ireland in their exclusive situation against their countrymen! This is the settlement he proposes to the two nations, the encouragement Dr. Duigenan holds out to trade and manufacture, the lure to English capital. If the situation of the country is such as he describes, (but we have good reason to believe it is rather what

what he would have it thought to be than what it is) who would not prefer living in security in Botany-Bay? great as his reliance may be on the courage and vigilance of the Irish Protestants for his preservation, who would build or plant, or store his house with a week's provision, or attempt more than a tartar existence, if such be the spirit of the country? Who would give a year's purchase for their lawns and their demesnes, if they must walk through their pleasure grounds with pistols in their pockets, have a barrack at their gate, and a guard in their parlour?

It may suit the ideas, and the knowledge of P. Duigenan, LL.D. to despise the strength and co-operation of two millions of a hardy, brave, and active race of peasantry. It may suit his feelings to insult them; but the greatest warrior and statesman of our days has repeatedly declared, that war was not to be carried on where the peasantry were not at least neutral. The subsistence and existence of armies depend on the good-will of the peasantry. Never was this truth more illustrated than in the late campaign in Switzerland, especially in the attack of Lucienslieg by General Hotze. The separation of America, perhaps, was decided by the sentiments of three peasants at Tarrytown. Common sense confirms what the

wisest politician of any age has written, that where we cannot exterminate, we must conciliate. There does not exist an animal in the creation that may not be rendered friendly by good treatment.

Dr. Duigenan takes every opportunity, in the course of his work, of insinuating and affirming, that the late rebellion was a Popish one, and even Page 104. goes so far as say, that not a Protestant was concerned in it. — Every general insurrection, which can take place in Ireland, must, in a great measure, consist of Roman Catholics, because they constitute the bulk of that class of which armies must be composed; but by a Popish rebellion, by which he means a Roman Catholic one, must be implied, besides the numbers being Roman Catholics, that the rebellion was actuated by some principle peculiar to the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion, otherwise every sort of disturbance in Spain or Portugal, or Austria, might be called a Roman Catholic rebellion, and every riot in London or Birmingham, a Protestant one.

Page 123. Accordingly Dr. Duigenan informs us, that the Page 79. Roman Catholics of Ireland committed nothing which they were not warranted, nay, commanded to commit, by the council of Lateran.

That

That the council of Lateran commanded the Roman Catholics to join the Jacobins in the subversion of all religion, government, and property; (which is the motive ascribed by government, after a minute investigation to the late rebellion,) is a very bold and extraordinary assertion. But in positive contradiction to it, the titular Archbishop of Dublin, a man of the greatest weight among the Roman Catholics in Ireland, so far from admitting that construction of the council, formally and publicly excommunicated all the adherents and abettors of the late rebellion. Dr. Duigenan could not be ignorant of this notorious fact, when he published that the Roman Catholics did nothing but what that council warranted and commanded. Who is to be believed on this point of Roman Catholic discipline; Dr. Troy, the Roman Catholic titular Archbishop, who excommunicated them, or Dr. Duigenan, who says they did no more than their duty?

It will require very substantial and particular proof to convince a person, seeking in history the knowledge of human nature exemplified in human transactions, that a spirit of insurrection, which, from Stockholm to Palermo, appeared more or less in every state of Europe, with exactly the same excesses as often as it got head, which was every where in deadly opposition to all religion,

but most particularly the Roman Catholic religion, should in Ireland alone be actuated by the principles of that religion, working to establish there, what it was every where else endeavouring to subvert—that the Roman Catholic church should there be supported by its most inveterate enemies, who, in every country which came under their power, persecuted its members, stript it of its possessions, dethroned the Pope, its supreme spiritual head, and detained him in their prisons an object of their insult and derision.

That the disposition of mind, created by exclusion and degradation, and the extreme of poverty, ignorance, and prejudice, their natural consequence, would not long escape the notice of an insidious and daring enemy, was very justly to be feared. But is it good reasoning to ascribe every desperate action the lowest class of a community can commit, and every feeling which may excite them, every opinion into which their poverty and ignorance may have been betrayed to their religious principles? It is not the way to promote the tranquillity and prosperity of any state, nor the general interest of religion and government. Might not some of the expressions contained in this book of Dr. Duigenan's, excite in the breast of a Roman Catholic, who might not know from what quarter

it came, a resentment not fairly to be ascribed to his religion ?

The surest way to come at an unprejudiced opinion, is to put ourselves in the situation of those whom we judge. Let us for a moment suppose the Roman Catholics the minority of the state in point of number, that they were in possession of the whole power, and had enacted a code of penal laws against their Protestant fellow-subjects, affecting them in every branch of their civil existence. Let us suppose the full force and spirit of exclusion and consequent degradation acting against them, their religious tenets misrepresented, their political opinions calumniated; their loyalty, though it were avowed by the legislature, traduced by the hireling writers of party; pure as the principles of the Protestant religion may be, and friendly to good government, might there not exist, in spite of them some symptoms of discontent, some readiness to join in any scheme which might offer an hope of change? Ought they to be ascribed to the Protestant religion? As well ascribe to the form of a kelt or a plaid, the troubles which an attempt to change their dress might have produced among the highlanders of Scotland. That most of the grievances I have just described have been removed, by the generous and humane interference of

of the British cabinet, is acknowledged with the strongest sense of gratitude.

That the reign of his present most gracious Majesty has been a series of benefits to the people of Ireland, will never be forgotten ; but unfortunately sufficient time had not elapsed to diffuse their effects through the great mass of population. Had every party in Ireland sincerely adopted that benign spirit of conciliation which distinguishes the British influence in that country for the last twenty <sup>Page 198.</sup> years, and which Dr. Duigenan acknowledges and deprecates, little of that animosity which has reduced our country to so lamentable a crisis would at present exist.

The short history of Irish Independent Legislature would not have closed with the melancholy details of coercion and rebellion ; nor the last pages of her annals have recorded the speeches of Irish patriots, lamenting in the most impassioned language, that she is no longer to exist a free and independent nation ; depending upon Great Britain for the exclusion of more than two-thirds of her people ; a just, commercial, and wealthy nation ; confining the representation of property to less than one-third of its inhabitants ; extending its taxation to them all ; raising the revenue of government

ment upon the many; restricting the emoluments of it exclusively to the few; founding its stability in the love of its subjects; and relying on their attachment to a system of which, in five dreadful rebellions, depopulation, confiscation, and waste, have been the natural and avowed consequences; to whose existence the torture of their persons, the burning of their houses, the making over of their property to the discretion of soldiers, the suspension of their courts of justice have been but just now deemed absolutely necessary: as a nation respectable in the eyes of Europe; founding its boasted existence upon principles which the wisest and greatest nations of Europe have disclaimed more than one hundred years ago, as unchristian, impolitic, illiberal; forgetting that in political morality the next virtues to the wisdom and courage of removing the cause, are patience and resignation in submitting to the effect. Perhaps, had another system been sincerely and universally adopted; instead of this, her annals might have had to record through ages the prosperity and greatness of an independent state, the glory and the strength of the sister kingdoms.

Since to look back to what we might have been, can afford but unavailing regret, let us look to what we yet may be, and take care that the costly sacrifice, which a fatal chain of events has

has rendered, perhaps, unavoidable, be not also ineffectual. Let experience confirm what reflection dictates, that it is impossible to have in a nation one spirit and two laws.

The feelings which penal restriction excite are naturally transferred to the religion in favour of which they are enforced, until what is in reality a sense of political grievance, takes the taint of a religious prejudice, and furnishes a new argument to the shallow declaimers against the mischiefs which they weakly imagine religion to have caused. Where there exists no real motive of discontent, no partiality of government, it will be found no easy task to persuade men to risk their lives to effect a change.

It is precisely ordered, says the zealous and indefatigable Abbé De Barruel, in his account of the instructions given to the different degrees of illuminés, (a conspiracy we are taught to believe as dangerous, and more deep and universal than that of United Irishmen;) that its agents shall seek in every country, not for men disaffected without cause, through levity or ambition, but for those who labour under some real grievance—On these they are to rely as sure instruments of revolution.

The true cause of discontent and insurrection in a country is a political question of great importance; until it be clearly ascertained a remedy will be sought in vain. For the foregoing general reasons, it appears in the present instance to be unconnected with the principles of any religion, unless, by the wretched state in point of comfort and instruction, of a numerous peasantry and the sort of seperate interest in the state, which penal laws against religious opinions cannot fail to create.

Let us now examine the particular reasons Dr. Duigenan himself gives us for ascribing the rebellion to another cause.—On the 4th of May, 1795, page 120, in a speech, published, as his, by Chambers, Dublin, he says, “ The Roman Catholics “ have been called upon by the Republican fac-“ tion to make their present demands; that rest-“ less faction saw they were too weak to carry on “ their designs of establishing in this kingdom a “ Democratic Republic on the French scheme, “ without the assistance of the bulk of the people, “ they have therefore called into their aid the “ Roman Catholics, by offering to them the sub-“ version of the constitution.”—This was pub-  
lished as his opinion on the 4th of May, 1795; <sup>Page 113,</sup> but in December, 1799, he says, in contradiction <sup>Fair Re-</sup> <sub>presenta-</sub> to it, that so early as 1792, the Irish Romanists <sup>tion.</sup>

*bad projected their rebellion and commenced their operations preparative of it.*

Page 116. *They sent a deputation to Belfast to seduce the Protestant Dissenters there, to enter into a confederacy with them for the annihilation of the constitution, under pretence of a co-operation for a reform of the representation in parliament, and to the operations of that deputation is the late feeble insurrection to be ascribed.* How are these two opinions to be reconciled? Was this a Popish rebellion, whose principles were those of French democracy, inimical to all religion; into which some of the Roman Catholics were seduced, by specious pretexts, in 1792, which was headed and conducted by Protestants, or, according to this searcher of consciences, by Arians and Deists, still farther from Catholics? Whoever has read the public papers knows that the following were the leading men in it, that not one of them ever was reputed a Roman Catholic, that they were men of influence and property: Lord Edward Fitzgerald, Sir Edward Crosby, Bart. Hampden Evans, Esq. Cornelius Grogan, Esq. Bagnal Harvey, Roger and Arthur O'Conner, Napper Tandy, Theobald Wolfe Tone, and his brother, two Mr. Sheares's, Blackwell, Bond, Emmet, Sampson, Jackson, &c. &c. How does Dr. Duigenan know that these men were Deists and Arians? What right has he to say it? Has he

he really any reason to know the particular belief of each of them, or does he publish this without knowing any thing about it? Not one of the four men in the Irish Directory, supposed generally to be Protestants, was really so; no, they were Deists or Atheists; but the one director who passed for a Roman Catholic was really a bigotted Romanist: *Fair Representation*, page 104. It is so old and common a custom with certain classes of men to call those who differ from them in opinion Atheist and Deist, that it is become ludicrous. Does he pretend to judge them by their works? Should I then be warranted to call a Protestant a Turk, if he should happen to be notoriously deficient in Christian charity? Would not a man be laughed at, who should say, on the same grounds, that there was not a Roman Catholic concerned in the rebellion? It is very certain, that there was scarce a Roman Catholic, of any rank concerned in it, scarce one possessed of any landed estate; not one Roman Catholic titular prelate; all its adherents were publicly excommunicated by the Roman Catholic church; all the property, title, and consequence, concerned in it, belonged to Protestants, or according to Dr. Duigenan, to Arians and Socinians. No foreign Roman Catholic state is even suspected of having fomented it. Its success would have been fatal to the Roman Catholic church in Ireland. The head of that church, and those who believed in

it, were every where its first victims. Its only ally, and abettor, and exciter, was the most deadly enemy the Roman Catholic religion ever knew ; its principles as the government of England and of Ireland, and Dr. Duigenan himself affirm, were principles of democratic republicanism, or rather of disorganization and anarchy, incompatible with the belief or practice of any sect of Christianity, but more especially inimical to the Roman Catholic religion, as most averse to such a change.

Page 83. Does he not himself inform us, that the French atheistical usurpers proscribed Christianity and all its professors ; they consequently proscribed popery, the heretofore established religion of France, with all its interests, and confiscated the whole church revenues. Can he deny this tendency of their church to loyalty as a religious duty, while so many members of the French clergy are still among us ? That body, nearly to a man, have been martyrs to the cause of monarchy and religion. If it be not to the spirit of their religion, to what cause are we to ascribe the charity, the patience, the uniformly exemplary conduct, of that vast number of individuals, to whom the generous protection of England has been extended ?

Page 83. Of all the barriers of honour, hereditary dignity, love of royalty, personal attachment, or military obedience, which surrounded the throne of France, the Roman Catholic religion has been its strongest

strongest bulwark ; it has opposed, with most effect, and still checks the fatal progress of innovation in morals, in philosophy, in religion, and in politics.

It is hard to conceive, how Dr. Duigenan, with all these proofs, with the reports of the secret committees, and his own assertions on other occasions ; can now, in contradiction to them all, affirm, that this was a Roman Catholic rebellion. To mislead the minds of men, by attributing our disasters to a wrong cause, is doing an injury to the state. What can his design be, or what adequate interest can he find in striving to make two-thirds of the people of Ireland appear to the world so contemptible, so blood-thirsty, so odious ? Will not the first question of every sensible man be, under what laws, what government, do they live, who are the leading men among them ? There are no Protestant families of any antiquity who are not allied over and over again to Roman Catholics ; will any stranger ask the Irishmen he meets, their catechism, before he forms his opinion of them ? What a miserable excuse ! separately, they are a good kind of people, taken together, they are a set of blood-thirsty traitors, &c. Was a Dublin newspaper, with advertisements for Protestant footmen, Protestant gardeners, Protestant blacksmiths, or an American newspaper, advertising a fine cargo of Irish slaves, ever read in a coffee-house, in London or in Philadelphia, with-  
Page 152,  
121.

out both Protestant and Catholic being equal objects of pity? Do such facts redound to the honour of the empire? If they took place in any other country, what would be our opinion of its government? It will be found upon cooler reflection, that to plead the cause of the Catholic is to plead the cause of the Protestant; to traduce the one is to sink the other in the public mind. The Catholic cannot be reduced to beggary and despair without the Protestant being ruined.

— Non hostem inimicaque castra  
Argivum, vestras spes uritis.

The sufferings of humanity, the shrieks of the victims of coercion, the ruins of so many noble towns, the half-consumed remnants of cabins, which skirt our high-roads for hundreds of miles; the naked famished spectres of widows, of orphans, of helpless old age, crawling from the ruins, to attract the eye of the passenger; are they objects less rendering to the heart of the Protestant than of the Catholic? will he withdraw his hand from his purse, or chide his weakness, when he reflects that they are Catholics? will the inquiring stranger, whose observations can furnish him with the means of comparison, rest satisfied with this bare assertion, the tenets of the Roman Catholic religion are the cause of all this? This is the least destructive of five rebellions which they have caused. Good judges of mankind will never believe, that such a monstrous mass of wickedness, as Dr. Duigenan describes, has accumulated with all

the

the faults on one side only, or that in a corrupted air there can be a partial atmosphere ; that such deplorable severity was necessary to support a system which had no essential vice in it : but if he finds that the authors, who write in support of it, have recourse to false assertions, and gross misrepresentations, what will his opinions be then ?

Nothing is so apt to make men bad, as telling them incessantly that they are so ; if they are, it only irritates them to hear it ; if they are not, a sense of injury and insult may incite them to act as if they were. The wanton aggravation of the temper of a people is as much to be deprecated as the wanton effusion of blood, or waste of property. Such expressions, as this work is replete with, are mere provocations to rage and violence, not means either of defence or of offence, which is all the most inveterate warfare ever warranted among civilized nations. There are many, very many, excellent, most charitable, most liberal, Protestant families, in Ireland, living, in peace and harmony, with their Roman Catholic neighbourhood : in more than two-thirds of its counties there was no rebellion. What motives can exist for thus endeavouring to interrupt the confidence which, if it ever was suspended, is beginning to be re-established between them ? Too many respectable families have

already

already turned their backs upon this unhappy soil, the gate is open to all, the passage short which separates them from it for ever. The world lies before them ; and, for more than a century, religious dissensions, the greatest curse of society, have been wisely banished from every other region of it : do not increase their number ; do not reduce this country to the situation of a colony of slaves and drivers ; do not expel from us the profits of industry, the fruits of education. Very few are interested in supporting such ideas as this *Fair Representation* contains, fewer, still, would support them in the face of truth ; let not the interest of the whole country, of Protestant and Catholic, be sacrificed to those few. It was once a noble condition of peace granted, by the Romans, to a barbarous nation, that they should no longer sacrifice their own children to their idols. Let England make it the condition of Union, that you shall not sacrifice your own fellow-subjects to the spirit of party.

His comments upon the *History of Ireland* afford a curious illustration of human nature, and shew that the coldest and most plodding mind may be absolutely deprived of its faculties by party rage ; it is undoubtedly a species of madness.

Page 53. *No sooner had the reformation been introduced into Ireland, which was not, with any very material effect,*

effect, till the reign of James I. than the natives and these English settlers began to unite, and form alliances; their mutual enmity abated, &c. Then, after thirteen lines in the same sense, he says, from such a confederacy, cemented by bigotry, and inflamed by religious fury, against their fellow-subjects, sprung Desmond's and Tyrone's rebellions, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth! I should not have taken notice of this mistake if I had seen nothing in it but inadvertence.

Extolling the strength of the Irish Protestants Page 168; by the seven millions which, in the year 1799, they furnished to the exigences of the state; a great part of which it was necessary to borrow in England, (a strange proof of strength and independence,) he says, one part in forty, only, of them, was or could be paid by *Irish Romanists*. Every man who contributes to the wealth of the state, in any manner, pays a portion of what the state is engaged for: there is not a man who carries a spade, or works a loom; not the meanest Irish peasant, nor his child; but has contributed something to these seven millions, or to the security they are raised upon, over and above what he has paid, by indirect taxation, on soap, candles, malt, leather, &c. Which would injure most the security, given for these seven millions, the loss of those who, as he pretends, possess thirty-nine parts, out of forty,

of the property of the country ; or the loss of the great mass of Irish peasantry ? The country might subsist without the former, and they must leave the great source of wealth, the territory, behind them ; but where would the wealth be, if the others were lost ? If agriculture is allowed to be the source of wealth, in Ireland, the Roman Catholics, whom he so much despises, contribute to it ten to one more than the Protestants. We have all heard of the members quarrelling with the belly, but this is the first time I ever heard of the belly quarrelling with the members, and accusing them of not contributing their share.

Princes and Lords may flourish or may fade,  
A breath can make them, as a breath has made ;  
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
If once destroyed, can never be supplied.

It is a common mistake, to measure the wealth of a country by those who possess the surplus of produce, over consumption, and to reckon for nothing the efficient cause of all produce. The Poles and Russians, who calculate their riches by the number of their peasants, come nearer to truth.

Page 53, of this work, contains a striking epitome of Irish history : where, indeed, there is room for meditation. Speaking of four

rebellions which took place, from the accession of Queen Elizabeth to the revolution: *Above half of the Inhabitants, at each time, perished by famine and the sword; multitudes deserted the kingdom, all improvements were destroyed, the progress of industry was effectually impeded, arts and sciences were banished, and Ireland, by such means, though intimately connected with the richest, most civilized, and industrious, nation in the world, is now a century behind the rest of Europe in civilization, and every species of valuable improvement; all owing to the superstitious attachment of a considerable portion of its inhabitants to the Romish faith, in opposition to the Protestant establishment: a large portion of its natives, all Romanists, is, by the same curse, continued in a semi-barbarous state.* I take this statement from Dr. Duigenan's work, in his own words, leaving out none of them which can alter the sense; though it might be made from any history of Ireland or England.

Here, then, we have discovered the grand cause of the misfortunes of Ireland: not the nature of her connection with England, from which, except in the regency-business, no inconvenience has been felt during a century; but in the attachment of a considerable portion of her inhabitants to the Romish faith.

But the greatest states of Europe, during the same period, remained as superstitiously attached to the Roman Catholic faith ; and their civilization and industry, their progress in valuable improvement, in arts, and in science, have been such as to leave it a matter of doubt, in reasonable minds, whether they have not surpassed England herself. They have undergone none of those calamities of which, in a few lines, he has presented so terrible a picture. There is nothing then in the Roman Catholic faith itself, nor in the attachment of a people to it, which can have been the cause of these misfortunes, or of this backwardness in civilization ; since, tried upon a very large scale in many other countries, they have no where produced such dreadful effects. Neither the Roman Catholic faith, nor the superstitious attachment of a large portion of the inhabitants to it, would probably have produced and prolonged barbarity in Ireland, and reiterated depopulation, if it had never been attempted, not merely to establish, (that is to endow, with the church-revenue, which the state had a right to use as it thought fit), but, by the operation of severe laws, to force to large a proportion of population to abandon that religion to which they were so obstinately attached, and take up another in its place. If we seek in history for useful information, and not for stimulants to party rage, may not such a conclusion be fairly drawn ? The same

same evils were spreading fast in Scotland from the same cause; the cause was removed, the evils ceased, and Scotland has, ever since, been in a progressive state of improvement. During near a hundred years, Germany was verging fast to barbarity and depopulation from the same cause, it was removed, and Germany has, ever since, been in a progressive state of improvement.

Nor have I ever perceived, nor heard, that any religious animosity remains, or mingles, in any degree, with national rivalry, or added any thing to the unavoidable asperity of war between the Austrians and Prussians.

The grandest confederacy the world ever beheld, on the wisdom of whose institutions the statesmen of every other nation, and our own, are obliged to found the rudiments of the science they profess, suffered under the evils which all of us complain of, and applied successfully the remedy which we supplicate, the wisdom and humanity of the legislature to grant to us, and to the British empire.

Dr. Duigenan asks for an instance of indiscriminate advancement of Catholic and Protestant, in a popular state, with defiance to produce it. The empire of Germany, composed of some despotic, and some free states, cannot in the aggregate be called

called a despotic state. Is it not rather, if the expression may be used, a republic of sovereigns? It consists of a vast number of equal and independent members, under a chief of their own choosing, governed by laws of their own making, deliberating and deciding by suffrage according to those laws upon their common interest. The members who compose the diet of the empire are in that capacity no more than the members who compose our house of peers. What may be their rights in their *own* estates, does not alter their nature there, no more than it would that of some of our peers, if the sovereignties which existed in their families had remained in them. Surely the influence of the Pope, and the incompatibility of the Roman Catholic religion might be more reasonably dreaded in this vast and free association than among us. Yet the late Prince of Hesse Cassel, or the Elector of Saxony, lost none of their rights in that free state, by adopting the opinions they thought proper.

I do not know whether the Doctor will allow the American states to come within the pale of Christendom. He looks quite through the consciences of men, and his decisions are absolute upon that subject. America, with the experience of the world, and her own, (for she began by religious persecution,) and with men reputed wise,

to turn it to her use, avoided the evils we are speaking of, though she had within her territory more different religions than any nation in the world ; by putting them all on an equal footing. It is presumptuous to interfere with the education of the learned Doctor, but I recommend to his perusal the declaration of the states of Virginia on that subject. If any thing could be expected from his candour, where the means of exact information are not immediately at hand, many other instances might be produced among the free towns of Germany, Osnaburg, Frankfort on the Main, &c.

This assertion, I believe, may be risked, and a slight review of Europe will suffice to confirm it—every state is backward, and has suffered in civilization and improvement, in proportion to the extent and severity of its penal laws against subjects of a different religious persuasion.

In his observations upon those which England has enacted, and of which he makes so very light, as men generally do of what they do not feel, he leaves out many of the most humiliating, and insult has a worse effect in society, than injury. It is true, most of them, through the generosity of the legislature, have been repealed, but the spirit which they so long maintained, can subside but by degrees: the sea is not calm as soon as the wind ceases

ceases to rage. There still remains enough to make two separate classes in the state, which is the worst effect they ever had. If a few observations are made upon them here, it is only to take notice of some political opinions advanced by Dr. Duigenan which appear very erroneous.

His comparison of the tenure, by which farms are generally held in England, is not a fair one. Farms, brought to their full perfection, may be held profitably by a short or uncertain lease. But farms, which sometimes require nearly the value of the fee to make them profitable, as was the case in Ireland, when the law preventing Catholics from taking leases of lives was enacted, can only be cultivated by a landlord, who has capital and means, or a tenant who had a long interest in them. Therefore those laws were said to have impeded the improvement of the soil.

Page 132. The law which gave the fee of the father's estate to his son, for becoming a Protestant, he says, was *conformable to the law of nature, and the common law of the land*; and the law which held out the estate of the family to be gravelled, unless the elder brother became a Protestant, he says, *is far from being a hardship, and is itself fair and equal*. Suppose twenty Protestant families subject

to the same uncertainty of inheritance, unless they become Roman Catholics ; will it then be so hard to conceive what made property insecure ?

The laws which prevented tradesmen from re- Page 135. alizing their fortunes in land, he gravely tells us, tended to *extend trade*, rather than to *confine* it. It is generally understood, that the best encouragement to trade is security of possession ; and total liberty in the disposal of the capital which it may acquire. As the learned Doctor has written professedly for the instruction of ministers, we may hear of a law to encourage trade in London, by which no merchant in that city shall be allowed to purchase land. Perhaps, if he had taken notice of the law empowering any man to take a Roman Catholic's horse for five pounds, he might have found, it encouraged the breed of useful common cattle ; or that the statute of 7th James 1st. empowering any magistrate to take a Roman Catholic's wife, and keep Cap. 6, sect. 28. her in prison unless he paid ten pounds a month for her, or redeemed her by paying a third of his property, was an useful trial of conjugal affection ; or that the statute by which a barrister, attorney, or solicitor, marrying a woman of the Popish religion, shall be deemed a Papist, was meant merely as a compliment to the gallantry, tender acquiescence, and complying sensibility of those professions : perhaps too he may see in the exclusion of

Roman Catholics from parliament and the high offices of state, a salutary curb to ambition.

With regard to the obstacles stated, in *the Case of Ireland Reconsidered*, to have been formerly in the way of the education of the lower orders of the people in Ireland, I shall only observe, that by every account, almost all the peasantry are Roman Catholics. No Roman Catholic could keep a school, but indeed, if a Protestant came and chose to set up one amidst this Roman Catholic peasantry, they might send their children to it. Government established schools for the gratuitous education of the poor, Page 128. but Roman Catholics were excluded from them: there is one university in Ireland; Roman Catholics could not take degrees in it: and they were prohibited by law from seeking education abroad. A great degree of ignorance and prejudice must have existed among a people so circumstanced. Penetrated, as I most sincerely am, with the deepest sense of gratitude for the indulgences lately extended to the Roman Catholics of Ireland, by government, and its present paternal attention to the education of its subjects, it is with the greatest pain that, in speaking of the remaining effect, I have found myself obliged to recur to the cause which happily no longer exists. I should not have done it in the present instance, but for the charge of

of direct falsehood contained in Doctor Duigenan's *Fair Representation*.

Among his many erroneous notions of government, I must take notice of a most dangerous abuse of an undeniable principle, which, if it ever gained admittance, would instantly overturn every foundation of British law and British liberty. Page 208, arguing in the same strain as in the rest of his book, for the justice and necessity of the exclusion of two-thirds of the inhabitants of Ireland, he says, *property is on the side of the Protestants, as thirty-nine to one; they have, therefore, though the smaller number, a right to govern the greater, by the principles of the British constitution.* But, by deducing from this, a right in the majority of property, to exclude, by any law, the minority, does he not perceive that he destroys the very principle by which the decisions of the majority are deemed binding on the whole? The decisions of the majority carry weight only as an efficient and preponderating part of the whole. Suppose the same principle, or rather abuse of principle, admitted into the houses of parliament. If every majority, as such, could pretend to this same right of governing, to the exclusion of the minority from participation in debate, power would soon be concentrated in a very small number. The principle, of power deriving from property, is abandoned, where

property is formally excluded. He introduces also (page 101) a strange constitutional doctrine, by denying to the king of England a right to give his royal assent to a bill for the relief of his Roman Catholic subjects, because he has taken an oath to maintain the Protestant reformed religion established by law. But Judge Blackstone, whose authority Dr. Duigenan will not dispute, says, that the parliament, of which the king is an efficient part, may even change the religion of the country. Great as my respect for an oath is, I can conceive no engagement which may not be dissolved by the full, fair, and unequivocal consent of the parties contracting, and all other interested parties.— But this is entirely foreign to the present question. Whatever may be the law of the land, to which his majesty, in his legislative capacity, has given, or may hereafter give, his royal assent; according to that law, has his majesty sworn to maintain the Protestant reformed religion. But no part of the coronation oath takes from his majesty the power of giving his royal assent to any law which the interests of his subjects may require, and the wisdom of his parliament propose. The rights and civil existence of the Roman Catholics, their fair share in the advantages of the British constitution, are not among *the rights and privileges of the bishops and clergy, or of the church of England committed to their care.* The Roman Catholics seek for nothing contrary to the preservation of the *doctrine,*

*doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof.* That oath by which Dr. Duigenan, with his usual depth of argument, affirms, that the sovereigns of Great Britain are bound to exclude their Roman Catholic subjects from parliament, was taken by the sovereigns of Great Britain, before Roman Catholics were excluded from parliament in Ireland. The oath is of the 1st of William 3d. the act which excludes them of the 3d.

Innumerable other errors and contradictions might be detected in the course of this *Fair Representation*; but I fear I have already presumed too far upon the patience of my readers. After this torrent of abuse, after calling them blood-thirsty traitors, and all that rage can suggest, Dr. Duigenan now assumes a conciliatory tone, assures us, that Roman Catholics are good inoffensive kind of beings, taken separately, even capable of maintaining the relations of peace and amity in common life; he extols the charity and forbearance of Protestants, (of which he himself is an example) and tells us, they mix in society and frequently intermarry. They do thank God, but they do not entertain any such opinion of each other as he would inculcate, or what sort of social intercourse could be expected? I am sure, if I were a Roman Catholic young lady, I would as soon marry Blue Beard, as a man who professed such an opinion of me.

Page 25.

It may not, perhaps, be uninstructive to give a short continuation of the political and moral history of Ireland, from another and a greater authority.

During the period, and under the system which produced these four rebellions, attended with confiscation, and waste, and depopulation, by famine, fire, and sword, and all the misery which has been so truly described; and a fifth rebellion, whose effects need not be described, “Ireland, in words “imputed to Mr. Pitt in his first speech upon the “Union, felt the narrow policy of Great Britain, “who, influenced by views of trade and commercial advantage, and tainted and perverted with “selfish motives, had treated her with partiality and “neglect, and never looked upon her growth and “prosperity as the growth and prosperity of the “empire at large.” May I be allowed, *non passibus aquis*, to follow this great man and finish the picture? Lamentable as this situation is, it is not all. There was yet another, and a deeper curse in reserve for Ireland. In every other country, domestic union would have been the consequence of such external oppression; it is the precious jewel in the head of adversity. Ireland had to suffer for ages, not only from the narrow policy, the taint, and perversion, of selfish motives in England; but the same narrow

policy, the same selfish motives, embittered by the fouler taint, and more inveterate perversion of religious bigotry, weakly felt by some, and wickedly feigned by others, made a part of her people at home not only look with jealousy upon the growth and prosperity of the people at large, but made that party consider them as, so far from the growth and prosperity of the kingdom, that a code of laws was enacted, whose natural and direct tendency was to prevent and keep them down. Whatever buds of prosperity the power of nature forced through this ungenial soil, were blasted in the storms, such elements prepared, or swept away from the surface of the earth by the scythe of war, in five full harvests of civil discord. The constitution of the country was undermined by the slow chronical distemper of its own system, and racked by its periodical convulsions, at the same time that we are told, it was overlooked by the jealous and malignant eye of England.

The consequence, the wealth, the genius, the hopes, every moral, every political virtue, withered under this middle regimen, to which she was delivered over; at equal distance between the welfare of Ireland and of England, defrauding both of the fair portion designed for them by nature: England of the improved strength of all her subjects, Ireland of the equal protection of her sovereign. Like the middle

man between the cultivator and the proprietor, counteracting the fertility of our soil, withholding from the landlord the fair produce of property, from the peasant the fair reward of industry. Who are these great middlemen between us and England? who have grown great and rich under this system, who have systematically kept us weak and poor? who oppose a change of it? Who advise the Roman Catholics of Ireland to trust them, the very men who have always declared they would grant them nothing, rather than trust England, who has granted them almost every thing? There are evidently then to the attentive mind two great causes of jealousy and discontent in Ireland, each separately sufficient to ruin any nation. No man can reason well upon the state of this country, who does not keep them distinctly in his mind. How far they depend upon the nature of her connection with England, enough has been said and written in both countries to form an opinion. A tolerably accurate calculation might be made, (it would be a curious and instructive one,) of the immense sums of money, which the system by which Ireland has hitherto been held has cost, positively: and of the immense negative losses it has occasioned in population, cultivation, trade, manufacture, and civilization. What is the reason that Ireland, with all her natural advantages, is this day in so wretched a situation? Why is she not as rich, as industrious, as well

well affected, and as happy as England? The religion of her people is not the cause of it, because that religion has been tried every where, and has produced such effects no where. It is not essentially in the difference of religion which prevails there: that difference, managed with wisdom and temper, has ceased for a century and a half to produce such effects in any other country. That difference existed in America: she had the advantage of forming a constitution for herself, she enacted no partial laws, and the difference of religions has no bad effects. I have often wondered how that maxim, as weak as it is wicked, that *Divide et impera*, could ever have been mentioned as a principle of politics, how it came to be so often attributed to one of the wisest politicians that ever existed, who reprobates it in the strongest terms. It may establish, it is true, an intriguing influence in an enemies state, but in the heart of our own states it can produce nothing but weakness and ruin.

Ought not the most inordinate craving for calumny be wearied, at least, if it cannot be satiated, by the aspersions which, in the course of this *Fair Representation*, have been so lavishly and unremittingly thrown upon so many of the living? Must the last, silent, sacred, asylum, where misfortune has a right to rest; must the tomb itself be forced open to insult the ashes of the dead, and not of

the vulgar dead, nor of those whose memory may be placed, by party spirit, in a doubtful light ; but of an unfortunate, an universally lamented monarch, of whose memory the general shock of parties has produced but one unfair report ? - The most sanguinary and envenomed pursuers of Louis XVI. never did, in the phrenzy of their rage, utter against him such an accusation as the pen of Dr. Duigenan has recorded. Rabaud, Barnave ; none of the French Protestants who took the lead in the most violent period of the revolution, ever accused Louis XVI. of a persecuting spirit. But read the words of *Fair Representaition* : (p. 72) *Till the dissolution of the monarchy, the French Protestants, in the true spirit of Popery, were, with fire, sword, and galleys, particularly in Languedoc, continued to be hunted like wild beasts.* Ye true friends to government and to religion be not ashamed of your feelings, do not condēmn the tear that starts into your eye, when that fatal subversion of the altar and the throne is recalled to your memory.

This assertion is utterly false. Let him produce a single instance where the house or property of a Protestant was burned, his person molested by the sword or the galleys for his religion in Languedoc, or any other part of the French state, during the reign of Louis XVI. His abhorrence of religious persecution is well known ; his desire to reign equally

equally over all his subjects, by extending to all of them the equal advantage of his laws. The number of Protestants advanced to the first honors under him, and his grandfather is well known. The order of merit instituted for them existed till every order was destroyed at the revolution. Who, that took any interest in the affairs of Europe, does not remember the parental solicitude, the personal activity of that excellent sovereign, for the welfare of his Protestant subjects? The proceedings on that occasion, the manner in which the parliament of Paris were consulted; many of the prelates and peers who took a lead in that business are now in London; the unusual summoning of the peers of France form one of the most remarkable epochs in its modern history.

The Protestant towns of Nimes, Montpellier, Bezier, &c. were among the most flourishing of France.

Who is now so ignorant of the history of the revolution, as not to know that the Protestants of France were members of the Notables in 1787, of the states general of France, convened by Louis XVI. in 1789.

*The Protestants of Languedoc were hunted like wild beasts, with fire, sword, and the galleys; in the true spirit of Popery till the dissolution of the monarchy!*

Who now can complain of calumny or misrepresentation?—Who would not condemn his pity as a weakness, and chide his nature for it, if he must feel it, when he sees the head of a religion, which could inculcate such a spirit, dragged from place to place, an object of insult and derision to the ferocious commissioners of the French republic? Who would dare to vindicate the memory of a monarch who could act in such a spirit?—Once more it is false!—but all Englishmen have not adopted the opinions of the Author of *Fair Representation.*\*

May this be a salutary lesson to those who may be tempted to give way to the fatal impulse of party spirit; here they may see to what inconsiderate lengths it will hurry the most considerate minds. What an enemy it is to individual happiness; what ravages it makes in society; what tears, what blood must be placed to its account! Let those whose souls are not hardened in guilt be now forewarned, that on earth there is no more dreadful situation than that of a good and feeling man, who has been impelled by this infernal

\* The epitaph of Arretino, who got his bread by defamation, was,—*Di tutti fuor di dio male dicendo, scusando si dicendo non lo conosco :*

On every one, but God, he heap'd abuse,  
And him—I know him not—was his excuse.

spirit to the perpetration of a cruel or a mean action,—the moment of reflection is terrible indeed,—the contempt of mankind,—the upbraidings of conscience,—the horror of futurity.

Virtutem videant, intabescantque relictā.

PERSIUS.

In all the Doctor's suppositions of the comparative numbers of Protestants and Roman Catholics,\*

I have

\* I intended here to have added a note, for which I was indebted to the researches of a most intelligent friend, containing a deep investigation of this matter, and a very ample refutation of the four reasons by which Dr. Duigenan supports his own *new opinion* in opposition to the official reports of government. The subject exceeding the bounds of a note, he has been prevailed upon to publish it separately. This is not the only occasion I have had of remarking the absolute contradictions of Dr. Duigenan's assertions upon the same subjects, in the course of a few months.—In his answer to Mr. Grattan p. 108. he says the tax on one hearth is two shillings; he says it comes to four-pence a head, consequently supposes six persons, but in Fair Representation, 235—he says not more than four if so many should be allowed.

P. 235, he mentions Mr. Bushe as a member of the Irish house of commons, but forgets that he was also a member of the revenue-board: and that, in his inquiry into the population of Ireland, he acted officially and had an opportunity of consulting all the documents which government had collected on the subject.

P. 236, when he finds his own opinion in opposition to Mr. Bushe, and Mr. Chambers, upon the disproportion of the increase

I have most readily acquiesced, to avoid interruption, though I believe any man who knows Ireland knows them to be unfounded. The argument of numbers, strong as it is, is but an argument of expediency, addressed to politicians whose less extensive minds reach not beyond the *ignorant present time*. This is not a mere question of arithmetic, nor a problem, of what is the exact

increase of population in England and in Ireland during the last hundred years ; he takes no notice that Ireland had just before the commencement of that period, been nearly depopulated by four dreadful rebellions ; that she was filling up an unnatural void, created by war, famine, and pestilence, in her population ; while England was only proceeding in her natural progression.

In his comparison of the number of Protestants to Roman Catholics, in which he contradicts the best government authorities ; which allow them to be at least three to one, he includes among the former, all the other dissenters, who are at least as numerous as the members of the Church of England.

From the best authorities it appears certain, that, **IRELAND THIS DAY CONTAINS MORE THAN FOUR MILLIONS OF INHABITANTS—THAT THREE MILLIONS OF THESE ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS—THAT NOT MORE THAN HALF OF THE REMAINING MILLION ARE PROTESTANTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—DR. DUIGENAN'S GROSS ATTACK UPON THE COLLEGE OF MAYNOOTH HAS BEEN REFUTED, WITH ALL THE EVIDENCE OF POSITIVE FACTS AGAINST UNFOUNDED ASPERSIONS, BY DR. FLOOD, A MEMBER OF THAT COLLEGE.**

proportion of subjects who may be put under exclusive laws. When we address the British nation, eminent for its justice, beyond any that ever appeared upon the face of the earth; indebted for its wealth, its power, and its reputation, to that virtue more than to all its other qualities: to that nation we represent, that if but one single individual laboured unnecessarily, under the grievances of which we complain, he would, with as much confidence, appeal to his God, and to his country, as *we* do, whose cause is the cause of *millions*. The measure of British justice never was the strength of those who applied for it. To those great men, who are wise, not cunning, statesmen, we humbly represent that justice is expediency. The power which is founded on terror and coercion is uncertain and unproductive. The real strength of every state is in the general attachment of its subjects; and partial government, cannot be expected to produce general attachment. If we have humbled ourselves so far as to abjure formally the foulest tenets, which never entered into the belief of your forefathers, nor of the Roman Catholic church; tenets which, in spite of the assertions of modern Deists, all the world knows never were in the creed of any religion: if we are ready to abjure every doctrine which can interfere with the power of the state: if the few, who argue

con-

still upon a system whose fallacy has long been avowed, are obliged to have recourse to such misconstructions as are here exposed, we trust that our king and our countrymen will relieve us from the grievous situation in which we are placed, by being thus made a separate nation among his majesty's subjects.

---

I have thus attempted to expose the fallacy of Dr. Duigenan's arguments. If any persons still feel inclined to rely on his authority, let them recollect, that the whole of his "*Fair Representation*" is an absolute contradiction to that opinion which he, but lately, so openly professed, when he bade British senators \*

Mark him, and write his speeches in their Books.

SHAKESPEARE.

That,

"If the Irish were one people with the British nation,  
"it would not be necessary, for the safety of the British  
"empire at large, to curb Romanists by any exclusive  
"law whatever."

\* Mr. Addington's Speech, p. 29. Mr. Douglas, p. 99.  
*London Edit.*

THE END.







